BF
1623
.P9
O5
1849

THE LIBRARY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH

CJC

~~133.335~~

ON THE

PREVALENCE OF CERTAIN NUMBERS

IN RELATION TO EVENTS.

SAPERE AUDE.

LONDON:
RICHARDS, PRINTER, 100, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

MDCCCXLIX.

THE LIBRARY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY. — GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE NUMERICAL RELATIONS OF EVENTS 1

CHAPTER II.

ON OUR ELEMENTARY IDEAS OF NUMBER AND OF NUMERICAL PROCESSES IN PURE ARITHMETIC.

Section 1.—On the primary arrangement of numbers in *two* general categories, namely, those which are analytically *productive,* and those which are *unproductive* in reference to the generative process of multiplication . . 14

Section 2.—On the theoretical suggestion of 33, 45, 77, 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, and 203 in relation to 9 (the traditional Pythagorean complement) as the limit of a distinct category 17

Section 3.—On the higher empirical cabalistic numbers 1197, 1274, 1477, and 3249 23

Section 4.—On the empirical and theoretical importance of 147 25

Section 5.—On the general prevalence of 7, as the great link of connexion between all the above-noticed mystical numbers 29

Section 6.—On the theoretical importance of 5 and 10, in relation to 9 and 19 42

CHAPTER III.

PAGE

ON THE CERTAINTY THAT THE INTERVALS OF YEARS OR DAYS BETWEEN IMPORTANT EVENTS ARE MEASURABLE BY THE SAME NUMBERS, AS THOSE, WHICH ARE SELF-SUGGESTED TO THE HUMAN MIND, AS THE EARLIEST AND MOST INFLUENTIAL IN PURE ARITHMETIC.

Section 1.—Historical proofs, in reference to the Roman, Persian, and Arabian empires 48

Section 2.—Historical proofs, in reference to Great Britain . 63

Section 3.—Historical proofs, in reference to France . . 75

CHAPTER IV.

RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS ON THE RELATIONS OF NUMBERS TO EVENTS 95

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE NUMERICAL RELATIONS OF EVENTS.

It is evident to the least reflecting metaphysician, or naturalist, that all events, past, present, and future, must hold a defined and predetermined relation to each other, as regards the *times* of their occurrence. The infallible wisdom of the Supreme mind fixes the exact moment of each event in the phenomenal Universe with as much certainty as it determines the special geometrical form, motion, and relative position of any existing corpuscule or body, at any given period in infinite space.

The universal harmony of the system of nature could not exist, if either the *temporal* or *spacial* relations of the minutest conceivable fraction of the whole scheme were left to chance. The budding of a leaf in a forest, and its dropping from the tree, are events predestined with as perfect an accuracy in relation to the other events of the world, as the first and last incidents in the rise and fall of an empire, or as the corresponding positions of the heavenly bodies at the present moment throughout the spacial expanse.

Our notion of that imaginary substitute for universal Providence, which we call *chance*, is the false creation of our ignorance ; we are indisposed to acknowledge *cause and effect* as necessarily connected beyond the limits of our comprehension. Where our knowledge ends, the *chaotic* empire of supposed irregular *casualty* begins ; and we are so accustomed by experience to *relative* beginnings, that we are always inclined to search for an *absolute* beginning. Hence arises the idea of an everlasting *previous* chaos ; another term for chance, in reference to the harmony of the material world. For the same reason, we talk of the " accidental coincidence " of analogous or similar events, where we cannot observe the evidence of *collateral* connexion, because we do not appreciate the necessity for *one* universal adjustment, independently of any direct series of special causes and effects.

Even where the apparently *diverging* tendency of direct causation, as regards distinct series of causes and effects, seems to preclude the probability of any subsequent general *convergence*, the collateral irregularities often conduce most unexpectedly to some perfectly harmonious result, in which they are all necessary causes of one general end.

One of the most remarkable instances of this unexpected self-adjustment is found in population statistics. The general apportionment of male and female births in any considerable district, always indicates an evident approximation to equality ; but the uneven proportion of the sexes in the offspring of a few neighbouring couples might occasion a great preponderance of one sex over the other, if the chances, as they are called, were not interfered with by some general law of equalising adjustment.

A yet more unlooked for sort of harmonious arrangement is manifest in another class of phenomena, where analogous or similar events, hold a fixed numerical relation to each other, with respect to the intervals of days, or years, between their occurrence, notwithstanding the very different modes in which they are occasioned. There is scarcely one historical personage, about whose career the public are interested, who has not been reputed to have his anniversary of success or misfortune, of victory or defeat. The death of many a noted man has occurred on the anniversary of his birth. Coincidences of this description are recorded as marvels, without attempts to account for them; but the most remarkable persons are only those whose peculiar destinies attract public attention. Although less distinguished human beings live and die without this honour, they are no less amenable to the same sort of fated numerical laws and unexpected rules of coincidence.

In despite of apparent accidents which interfere with our calculations upon an expected series of "causes and effects", our own individual plans are forced into harmonious adjustments by the impediments themselves. Similar, or analogous incidents in our own career during our mortal pilgrimage, take place in obedience to some inevitable laws of *numerical* fatality. A journey delayed by unexpected illness—the loss of the assistance of friends upon whom we reckoned, and whose death, or desertion, seemed, at the moment, to preclude all chances of success—and many other disappointments, are apparent obstacles to the realisation of our plans. Yet the result proves, that the original intention and the obstacles are co-ordinates in the great scheme of our destinies. The plan thus seemingly traversed, and the apparent impediments, are portions of a more general plan than any conceived by human reason. Not only are the obstacles necessary, but the moments of their occurrence are mutually adjusted in reference to numerical laws, as regards temporal intervals between them.

Deaths in the same family; returns of national crises; and a multitude of other notable occurrences, are frequently observed to take place after similar intervals of so many days. The *immediate* cause of any such event may be one of a long series of causes and effects, each stage of which differs from that which has tended to bring about the analogue. A lingering disease may terminate the life of one individual in a family; an unforeseen violence may occasion the death of another; a third may die in old age, from mere exhaustion of the organic instruments of his vital energy: yet the interval between the deaths of the first and second is often found to be the same as that between those of the second and third.

With the object of proving that a precisely determinable numerical influence really prevails over all mundane events, let any person keep a regular journal of news which he may hear or read of, and of affairs in which he is individually engaged, and record the obvious relations of such *present* events to similar or analogous *past* occurrences, observing the number of intervening days in marginal notes. A few months' experience will satisfy him, that on the 33rd, 45th, 77th, 98th, 119th, 140th, 147th, 161st, 182nd, or 203rd previous day, something happened, or was talked about in his presence, or was either thought of by himself or his intimate acquaintances, which holds an evident resemblance or analogy to the event which he is about to record as an occurrence of the moment. Should he persist in his rather tedious task for some years, he will not fail to perceive that on the 1197th, 1274th, 1477th, or 3249th day, the same sort of coincidence is obvious; and that if any of the above definite quantities be treated as multiplicands, and be multiplied by two, three, four, and other successive numbers in a regular arithmetical series, the results will harmonise with the length of such intervals still more remarkably.

Independently of any journal, the examination of national histories will demonstrate that 6498, or twice 3249, is a remarkable political number, denoting the quantity of intervening days between the striking events of contemporaneous history, and completing a political cycle with as much precision as three hundred and sixty-five days and the fraction of a day complete that of the orbitual motion of this planet.

The patient recorder of notable occurrences will also find, that the anniversary of any remarkable event is frequently the same day of some past year, in which something analogous has taken place, and that the interval of a lunar month will occasionally coincide with shorter *eventual* cycles in relation to affairs of social importance. Even the seventh day will sometimes, but rarely, be the term; and a succession of such weekly intervals, will often coincide with distinct phases in the progress of some continuous transaction which is concluded on the twenty-eighth day.

Similar coincidences, as regards the orbits of the sun and moon, have doubtless been observed from the earliest times of tradition, and have been the foundation of empirical astrology. The first and most obvious conclusions deduced from such observations would have suggested the idea of "cause and effect", the influences of the heavenly bodies being the assumed causes of terrestrial events; and as human intellect, in all periods of civilisation, is inclined to be content with this *primâ facie* sort of evidence, and to abstain from reasoning upon *causation* beyond the sphere of observation, there is no difficulty in accounting for the conventional belief, that the courses of other planets in relation to the annual and diurnal movements of this earth and to the fixed stars, govern the destinies of terrestrial things. The empirical astrologer is, however, fundamentally wrong in mistaking "coincidence" for "cause and effect". He finds a multitude of mundane coincidences in relation to his celestial observations; and this discovery induces his capital error of supposing, that the general position of the heavenly bodies at a given moment, is a *mystic power*. The practical result of his observations as regards coincidence may be correct; but if there be *one complete harmony* in the system of nature, the stars can only be the most general *indicators* of the universal scheme of coincidence, as regards fixed laws of quantity *in the abstract.*

The discoveries of Kepler and Bode raise our contemplations to higher elements of power than those of the astrologer. They extend the universal influence of numbers to the mutual relations of all possible heavenly bodies; and they suggest an abstract reason for the predestined movements and relative positions of every planet in a general system, and probably for the respective distances and ratios of movement of all suns or fixed stars throughout infinite space. The doctrine of *cabalistic* influences may, in this manner, be scientifically transferred from the domain of the astronomer, to the still higher arena of *abstract ideas of proportion.*

The only mode of applying certain numbers to the determination of eventual intervals between phenomena is, to treat them as specific or limited quantities of some defined portions of time, each of which must be appreciable *as a single season*, whose standard length is capable of being determined by reference to some general event in the physical world. A rotation of a heavenly body upon its axis, or its orbitual revolution in relation to some other celestial body, is one of the most obvious *general* occurrences of this description. Hence arise the recognised limits of the terrestrial day and year as regards this planet, which is the theatre of all events occurring on its surface. If another planet of the solar system were the locality, the days or years of such a planet might be standard or basis *units* in a computation without reference to the absolute length of time occupied by its diurnal or annual revolution. Abstract numbers themselves are independent of physical phenomena. The same dominant numbers are equally applicable to the days of Jupiter and of this earth, and to their respective years, although Jupiter's day and night occupy less than ten of our hours instead of twenty-four, while his year is nearly twelve of the Earth's.

The first proceeding in any *theoretical* investigation of the laws of mystic intervals is, to determine the rules *in the abstract* by which certain numbers can be resolved into a general system of order, and to discover those numbers themselves. The next step is, to ascertain *what* defined portions of eternal time are to be treated as single things capable of being numbered; and it is only by considering the most evident and general physical phenomena, as leading figures in the great dial-plate of nature, that we can *practically* apply the abstract theory. Days and years, however long or short, are the most obvious natural divisions of time, which first suggest themselves as the various measures of the conventional *one* in the abstract. Any of the remarkable numbers abovementioned, may therefore be scientifically applied to so many terrestrial days or years, when we endeavour to prove our allegations about their peculiar influence, by referring to the intervals between events.

There are three modes of proof:

First. We may examine history; and it will be found that the intervals between striking events in the destinies of a nation, are thus regulated.

Secondly. We may keep journals in the mode already suggested, and we shall observe that our own experience, as regards daily events, in which we are personally concerned, are fixed in relation to the intervals between them by the same numbers. In history, however, if we revert to remote periods, the *standard* will be the terrestrial year; in personal events it will be the terrestrial day of twenty-four hours; but the abstract numerical harmony will be equally complete, whether we adjust the chronology by years or days.

Thirdly. We may apply our general rules to the verification of prophecies, or to those forebodings of events which, although ridiculed by the incredulous materialist, are nevertheless legitimate *phenomena* in the estimation of the unprejudiced philosopher.

That some persons are able to *foresee* future events, in visions and dreams, is acknowledged almost universally; and the existence of such a power furnishes theologians with the most cogent evidence in proof of the truth of their religious doctrines. *Why* this marvellous faculty of instinctively apprehending the ideas of *future* events (which confounds our reason in the attempt to explain any requisite mental process, because *recollection* cannot be adduced as a solvent) should be one of the powers of the human mind, is not the question under investigation. But it is incontestable that privileged individuals, either as waking seers, or as sleeping dreamers and magnetised somnambulists, perceive the foreshadowings of events, some of which really occur long after the time of the prevision.

Metaphysicians assume, that so far as the elementary fact of an idea being apprehended by the Self is concerned, the result is the same, whether the idea be generated by the brain under the immediate influence of an impression through the organs of *the senses*, or in consequence of the activity of its own *imaginative* powers. In a dream or vision the idea itself is as much a physiological reality, as if it were the reflected image of an *external* object: in both cases, the affection of the *sensorium* is the result of cerebral action, however that action be excited. The brain's generation of the idea is no less a *physiolo-*

gical event, than an impression upon the brain itself is, through the organs of hearing or seeing; for the perceptive sensorium is affected in the same way in both cases. The dreamer and seer perceive the *illusion,* as if it were the image of some external material body acting upon the organ of sight, hearing, smelling, taste, or touch. We may therefore affirm, without hesitation, that the prophetic apprehension of a forthcoming event, *is itself an event;* and we may expect that the laws of adjustment, which regulate the intervals between analogous or similar occurrences in the *external* world of phenomena, will also prevail over the limitation of intervals between the time of a prevision, and that of its fulfilment.

Any journal kept with the object of determining relations between striking events, may be also appropriated to memoranda of the illusions of second sight and of dreams. The person who has patience to record the recollected waking presentiments, and the dreams of himself and of his most intimate acquaintances, and to make marginal notes in reference to their fulfilment, (whenever the event reminds him of the foreboding) will discover that the *interval* between the prevision and its accomplishment, is measurable by some one of those mystic numbers which prevail over the intervals of days between similar or analogous events themselves. Sometimes the fulfilment will occur on the anniversary of the dream—sometimes on the 33rd, 45th, 77th, or any other given day, in the series of temporal distances already alluded to—sometimes at an interval of 1197, 1274, 1477, or 3249 days after the dream.

Let us now endeavour to investigate the theory or *rationale* of this predestined selection of intervals, assuming that in the divine harmony of the universal adjustment of events, the most simple arithmetical truths are the most influential; and that the most simple rules of pure arithmetic are the most powerful in reference to the numerical ideas, which they first suggest. Our proceeding in the investigation of the problem, is to determine the order in which our own arithmetical ideas are generated by human reason—to analyse them without reference to the traditions of others or our own empirical observations—and then to arrange them in a system in which the most elementary and general are respectively the first in the synthetical arrangement.

Such empirically discovered numbers, as thirty-three, forty-five, seventy-seven, and many others already mentioned, are *not* remarkable as astronomically-suggested quantities. There is no reasonable mode of explaining *why* they prevail in reference to the intervals between analogous or corresponding events, unless we suppose that they have been selected by the Divine disposer of the phenomenal world, on account of some abstract and purely arithmetical qualities of the numbers themselves.

Arithmetical truths are all equally axioms. They must have existed in the world of abstract ideas from all eternity ; so far as human reason is capable of comprehending truth, the most complicated and the most simple arithmetical certainties are alike everlasting and unchangeable realities. Our notions of *first* and *last*, or of *priority* and *subsequence*, in reference to the processes by which we attain a conviction of such truths, do not interfere with our belief that they are co-eternal existences in the universe of intelligible things, and that they are independent of the graduated system of calculation, in which they are mutually connected under certain rules of an abstract character, in such a manner as to suggest the ideas of cause and effect, and of a progressive development.

We thus entertain two distinct general notions of numerical certainties. According to one of these notions, every arithmetical truth is an everlasting fact, independently of any arithmetical process : according to the other, the idea of an abstract quantity is producible by the process of multiplying two numbers into each other. The two seemingly opposite ideas of coincidence and of causation are thus merged in the idea of *everlasting being*, which is logically *one.* First and last, or priority and subsequence, under such a mode of considering the development of arithmetical processes and numerical products, *hold no abstract relation to time.*

Our experience, on the contrary, when we consider events as natural phenomena, always connects the idea of cause and effect with that of priority and subsequence *in reference to passing time.*

The arithmetical progression is the exemplification of a system of order, in which the more elementary idea arranges itself in the mind's conception of any process, as the parent of that which is more complicated ; and in our apprehension of this graduated scheme, our limited reason finds it difficult to disconnect the ideal hierarchy from our notion of *temporal* succession. But the Supreme mind cannot be thus influenced. In its perfect wisdom all possible truths are known simultaneously, as they must have been apprehended from all eternity. In its application of such truths to the development of the system of nature, absolute free-will must ever be the co-ordinate of power and knowledge. What we call *choice*, would only be limited in such a manifestation of power by that *wisdom*, which is an attribute of the Almighty principle presiding over the formation, the temporary maintenance, and the dissolution of all bodies in the material world.

Events, with the appointed times of their occurrence, are but the changes in the details of natural phenomena. But it is no less certain, according to our most refined logical notions, that there must have been some *temporal* regulations with regard to these changes. Basis rules of proportion in the abstract, must have been applied to the accidence of phenomena, or universal chaos would have *happened;* the laws of quantity thus dominant are precisely those which human reason would have selected, if we fixed upon such numbers as are suggested to our minds by meditation upon the *simplest* and most obvious arithmetical processes.

This method of argument supposes that the choice of the Supreme mind is guided by the same class of considerations as those which would influence our own, and it thus elevates human reason to the sphere of supreme thought; but it nevertheless presents the immense difference which must ever exist between limited educationally attained knowledge and that Divine Omniscient intuition which is necessarily the eternal attribute of the Supreme mind.

CHAPTER II.

ON OUR ELEMENTARY IDEAS OF NUMBER AND OF NUMERICAL PROCESSES, IN PURE ARITHMETIC.*

SECTION I.—*On the primary arrangement of numbers in* two *general categories; namely, those which are analytically* productive, *and those which are* unproductive, *in reference to the generative process of multiplication.*

OUR first ideas in arithmetic are those of the individual unit, and of any limited quantity of single units which constitute a number. All the dissertations of ancient or modern dialecticians about the *monad* (the philosophical synonym of the unit), do not inculcate a more precise notion of its absolute character, than that with which a child commences his arithmetical education. His idea of *one*, in the abstract, is that of an individual entity. Until he advances in his numerical education, he has no notion of the infinitely fractional subdivision of the unit; and his first impression is, that *one* in numeration is as indivisible, as the geometrician believes the single mathematical point to be from first to last, in his solution of mathematical problems.

---

* The reader, who is anxious to verify preceding allegations about the prevalence of certain numbers in reference to the intervals between important historical events, before he enters upon the theoretical argument, will find abundant evidence in the first section of the third, or next, chapter. The arrangement of the Essay, however, requires that the theoretical exposition of the doctrine should be introductory to such a verification.

The addition of indivisible units is the simplest process in arithmetic. It is the incorporation of some defined quantity of *ones* in a specific number. The converse of addition is subtraction, a process equally simple in principle, although not apprehended by our calculating reason, until we have attained the idea of a combined quantity by adding units: both processes deal with separable individual objects of thought, which are assumed to have had a previous existence in the mind, independently of their incorporation in any given number.

It is otherwise with *multiplication*, which is the abstract type of physical generation. This process *creates* a greater quantity of individuals than those which constitute the factors, or the multipliers and multiplicands. *Two added to three*, suggests the idea of *five*: two subtracted from five, suggests that of three. But two *multiplied* by three, produces *six;* the differential *one* is the *creature* generated by the mind's calculating energy. The process of division deals with the same principle in a less distinctive method : it does not create the idea of a higher quantity than that already accounted for ; but it reduces a number to the factors, whose combination in multiplication generates the idea of a greater number than that attained by their addition. Multiplication alone is the abstract generative process in pure arithmetic.

A most important fact presents itself to our meditation, in connexion with this obvious distinction between the processes of addition and multiplication. However we may analyse any quantity less than *five*, we cannot so apply its constituents as to attain the idea of a higher number than that of the sum total of the divided quantity. *One*, *two*, *three*, and *four*, do not *separately* supply the imagination with a sufficient quantity of units, to admit of the analytical arrangement which creates the notion of higher numbers. Two added to two gives the same result as two multiplied by two. *Five* is the lowest number, in which there are sufficient monadic elements to promote the ideal *generative increase* under the rule of multiplication. *Five is the first productive or prolific number*, as regards this mode of considering its elementary character ; and although it is the *fifth* in the regular arithmetical series of cardinals, it is the original, or primary, ordinal in the series of self-productive numbers containing within themselves the elements of abstract numerical generation.

We thus attain the notion of two distinct systems of *ordinal* numbers. In the first, the regular arithmetical progression of cardinals coincides with the ordinal progression ; in the other, the *first* ordinal is the *fifth* cardinal. Hence arises an early idea of two correlative series of numbers, which is based upon this primitive estimate of the intrinsic composition of any number. In the obviously simple mode of order, one is the first, two is the second, &c. In this more considered arrangement, *five* is the *first*, *six* the *second*, *seven* the *third*, &c., as regards the abstract development of the idea of *creative* multiplication.*

SECTION II.—*On the theoretical suggestion of* 33, 45, 77, 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, *and* 203, *in relation to* 9 (*the traditional Pythagorean complement*) *as the limit of a distinct category.*

The following table of the first nine cardinal numbers, in which 5 is treated as the first in a new series of ordinals, exhibits the earliest suggested application of the rule of multiplication to undivided numbers, without any attempt to analyse any single quantity in either series. In this obvious scheme of only employing preconceived ideas of numbers and of processes, the corresponding cardinals and ordinals are multiplied into each other; the neighbouring products are subsequently added in couplets. The result of this simple operation in arithmetic, is the development of the precise cabalistic quantities for whose rationale we are endeavouring to account.

---

* Our elementary notion of a series of *ordinals* is logically or dialectically independent of that of a succession of numbers in arithmetic. Many objects of our thoughts may be critically valued as first, second, or in any other ordinal place in a series, either because we apprehend them successively, or because they are considered more or less important in our general estimate of their value. We use *numerical terms* as the most convenient to express these relations, although we do not connect our idea of their mutual classical order, with those of arithmetic. *Ordinals* are logical terms of relation; their being blended with our ideas of cardinal numbers, is the consequence of our employing numerical terms as the most precise and explanatory method of arrangement. In the science of arithmetic, cardinals become ordinals on this account: but the term *first* may be critically applied to any high number, if such a quantity is the first of a series having peculiar attributes. Five is a cardinal number, whose *initiatory* position entitles it to the first place among the *ordinals* of the subordinate numerical series, suggested by the obvious distinction between the productive and unproductive numbers.

$$\begin{array}{l}
1\\
2\\
3\\
4\\
5\times 1=\ \ 5\\
\left.\begin{array}{l}6\times 2=12\\ 7\times 3=21\end{array}\right\}33\\
\left.\begin{array}{l}8\times 4=32\\ 9\times 5=45\end{array}\right\}77\\
\hline
45
\end{array}$$

The application of the multiplying principle to 5 is necessarily abortive in this table; but the other four successive numbers, namely, 6, 7, 8, 9, when multiplied by their corresponding ordinals in the table (which are treated as cardinals), give 12, 21, 32, and 45, as their respective products; the last of which is the only one of the required quantities. But if we add 12 to 21, and 32 to 45, we attain the respective sums of 33 and 77, while 45 appears in another form, as the total of all the numbers in the original cardinal series.

When we endeavour to advance in the solution of our problem by the same method, we do not find a similar adjustment; but if we treat 77 as a new point of departure, the continuous addition of 21 will successively suggest the other numbers, 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, and 203; the ratio of increase, 21, is the result of the formula, 7 × 3, which is medial in the table, between the abortive 5 × 1, and the terminal 9 × 5. The only required low cabalistic quantity unaccounted for by this theory, is 147, which is, however, referable to a more complicated arrangement of 7 and 3, in the formula of 7 × 3 × 7.*

Notwithstanding the simplicity of such a theoretical method of accounting for the prevalence of these precise numbers, it suggests several notable considerations with respect to numerical harmony:

First. The process of adding together all the numbers from 1 to 9 inclusive, gives the same result as the multiplication of 9 into 5; and it follows, that both these factors have striking attributes, which engage our attention at the outset of the investigation. We have already found that 5 is the first intrinsically productive number.

Secondly. Supposing 9 to be the terminating number of a distinct category, we observe that 7 is *medial* between it and 5, the first productive number; and that, in the above self-suggested arrangement, 7 is the correlative of 3. If they be treated as factors, the result is 21, the *ratio* of the progression after the suggestion of 77 as a new point of departure; while 77 is the highest quantity developed by our method of converting the ordinals of the productive numbers up to 9, into cardinals, and of treating them as factors.

Thirdly. 10 and 11 (the two next numbers to 9 in the regular arithmetical progression), when added together, give the same sum as 7 multiplied into 3, thus suggesting a new coincidence. The *irregular* portion of the cabalistic series (33, 45, 77) is obviously accounted for, by fixing upon 9 as the *terminal* of a category. The *regular* portion of that series which advances in the ratio of 21, may be referred either to 7×3, or to 10+11, as the elementary type of the increase: a coincidence as remarkable as that of the sum total of all the numbers from 1 to 9 inclusive, being equal to the product of 9 multiplied by 5.

---

* When we advance in the theoretical attempt to account for higher mystical numbers, we shall find the same mode of arrangement in 19 × 9 × 19 producing 3249, which is practically one of the most important.

Fourthly. The sum total of the *non-productive* numbers (1, 2, 3, 4) is 10, while the first productive number is 5, the half of 10; which very early suggestion in our elementary inquiry, is indicative of the abstract importance of a *decimal* system as an elementary idea in arithmetic, independently of any *artificial* method of accounting for its application by human invention to a conventional mode of calculation.

Fifthly. The two numbers 33 and 77 are both multiples of 11; the multipliers being, 3 in one instance, and 7 in the other,—an important fact, as regards 21 being the progressive *ratio* of subsequent increase; while they are developed by a more elementary process in the above table.

Sixthly. In the regular arithmetical progression we do not again find the same sort of harmony as that demonsrtated by the addition of the numbers from 1 to 9, which gives a total equal to the product of 9×5, until we meet with the addition of all the numbers from 1 to 19 producing the same result as that obtained by 19×10 ; for 190 equals the total of all the numbers from 1 to 19 inclusive. This consideration is important, not only in reference to 9, but to 19: and it is enhanced by the following mode of eliminating the fifth numbers in the ordinary arithmetical progression, where the abstraction of 5, 10, and 15, exhibits the intervening numbers in separate categories, each of which is an advance upon that preceding it, in the ratio of 20, or of 10 × 2.

$$\underbrace{1,\ 2,\ 3,\ 4}_{10}\ \underset{+\ 5\ +}{(5)}\ \underbrace{6,\ 7,\ 8,\ 9}_{30}\ \underset{+\ 10\ +}{(10)}\ \underbrace{11,\ 12,\ 13,\ 14}_{50}\ \underset{+\ 15\ +}{(15)}\ \underbrace{16,\ 17,\ 18,\ 19}_{70=190}$$

The first of these categories includes that of all the *unproductive* numbers, according to our method of applying the term. Their combination suggests the idea of 10; while the sum total of all the numbers, from 1 to 19 inclusive, is 19 × 10, or 190—a most harmonious coincidence, which distinguishes 19 in preference to any other number, as holding a peculiar relation to our first general idea of dividing all numbers into the two categories of productive and unproductive. The combination of 1, 2, 3, 4, is evidently suggested to reason as that of a peculiar class of numbers, having the same *negative* properties.

Seventhly. The elimination of the *fifth* successive numbers in an arithmetical progression, gives a distinctive initiatory character to 6 and 11, as the first members of their respective categories. One peculiarity of 6, is that of its being the first number which is capable of being *squared* under analysis, with a *productive result.* The analysis of 4, and the subsequent multiplication of its binary divisions into each other, is an *unproductive* process: still it is the model or type, although the *barren* type, of simple multiplication, as well as of that form of the process which is conventionally termed *squaring a number*. In both cases, no greater quantity than the original 4 is developed: but, in the analysis of 5, we obtain 2 and 3, the factors producing 6; and, in that of 6, the idea of 9 is suggested, by the squaring process being applied to the two equal portions of its constituent units. We thus discover 9 as the quantity developed, *productively*, by the first possible mode of dividing a given low number into two equal parts, and by treating them as factors. This result coincides remarkably with the traditional importance of 9.

Eighthly. The appearance of 11, as the initial of a new category, is no less remarkable in reference to 19. By eliminating 10 in the general progression from 1 to 19, where it holds the same *medial* position, as that of 5 in reference to the progression from 1 to 9, we attain the idea of two equal numbers of cyphers: two distinct groups, each consisting of nine separate numbers, are thus classed apart,—the transitive or intermediate number between them being 10. As the same idea of a *medial* number has already appeared in 5, the general notion of this transitive character being attached to some quantities in preference to others, is suggested as an elementary *principle* in the harmony of pure arithmetic. We subsequently discover, that this principle prevails in the determination of many high cabalistic numbers, which have been empirically observed, as the quantities of days or years between analogous events. For instance, 4 is medial in the category of the seven first numbers of an arithmetical series, and 3 has the same character as regards 5: and in the analysis of the higher mystic numbers, which are remarkable as the practical limits of intervals, both 3 and 4 are obvious multipliers of previously ascertained quantities.

The application of the squaring process to 11, without an attempt to analyse that number, gives 121 as a product. This peculiar mode of placing three figures (in which the third is the repetition of the first) has all the appearance of a casual adjustment; but we shall find, that it is the model of an *eventual* arrangement in a variety of cases. As 343 is the cube of 7, it is not surprising that 343 should be as influential as it really is : but such numbers as 313, 525, 757, present themselves frequently in chronology as the measures of striking historical intervals; and two of the most obvious formulas in the practical application of the theory, are 7×3×7 and 19×9×19, as co-ordinate factors. Until we square 11, this model or type of an arrangement in which the first and third figures are the same, does not suggest itself to our calculation; but since it is so frequently observed in chronological dates, we must infer, that it has a practical value, *as a principle*, in the determination of intervals between events.

SECTION III.—*On the higher empirical cabalistic numbers* 1197, 1274, 1477, *and* 3249.

All the cabalistic quantities above noticed which exceed 1000, are referable to 19 as a basis. Those which have been ascertained, empirically, to be the most constantly prevalent as the measures of intervals of days or years between similar or analogous events, are, 1197, 1274, 1477, and 3249.

19×9×7=1197, the lowest of these four quantities. They follow each other in a series marvellously in accordance with our foregone theoretical conclusion, that 77 and 203 are influential in relation to quantities *below* 1000. If we add 77 to 1197, the result is 1274. Again, if we add 203 to 1274, the result is 1477. That these two additions of 77 and 203 should coincide with the *requisite* quantities, is evidence in favour of the truth of the theory already advocated,—because 77 is the basis of the series produced by the successive addition of 21; and 203 is the last of the required lower numbers theoretically demonstrated to be the consequence of such an addition. We find that

$$19 \times 9 \times 7 = 1197.$$
$$19 \times 9 \times 7 + 77 = 1274.$$
$$19 \times 9 \times 7 + 77 + 203 = 1477.$$

As regards 3249, the same basis of 19×9 prevails. But this is a more independent number than the others, because $3249 = 19 \times 9 \times 19$,—a formula so artificial without reference to any previous theoretical discovery, that a most obvious principle is at once deduced from it by the observer of arithmetical coincidences, namely, that the original multiplicand 19, should be the ultimate multiplier. It has been already shown, that 19 is essentially a most important basis number in the system of pure arithmetic.

This concise explanation of the problem why 1197, 1274, 1477, and 3249, should be mystical numbers, separates them into two classes; the three first quantities being theoretically arranged in the first category, the single one (3249) being placed by itself in the other, as a general result of the relations between 19 and 9.

It is worthy of remark, that a new number, $280 = 77 + 203$, appears in the relations between 1197, 1274, 1477; and that $4 \times 7 \times 10 = 280$. It will be hereafter shewn, that the *decuple* multiplying power is most important as a specific multiplier. We have already observed, that 4, as the last of the unproductive numbers (whose total is 10), is the *medial* of 7, and that 10 is the *medial* of 19. The three numerical quantities of *four*, *seven*, and *ten*, have been already presented to the mind as early ideas, in the analysis of our most simple arithmetical notions; and it is in accordance with the general hypothesis, that 280 should be the aggregate measure of increase, in the determination of these higher numbers.

SECTION IV.—*On the empirical and theoretical importance of* 147.

147 has been observed by the accurate recorders of diurnal intervals between similar or analogous events, to be one of the most important. Whenever it appears in their journals, it is applicable to an intervening period between two occurrences so obviously connected, that it may be considered more practically influential than any of those numbers which are produced by adding 21, or some multiple of 21, to 77. It also frequently coincides with the length of one evident stage after another of a continuous transaction; none of the other numbers below 203 have this property in the same degree.

Such an empirically discovered fact about the peculiar mystic attribute of 147, classes it with the higher numbers, rather than with 140 and others which are nearest itself in the regular arithmetical succession. In our attempt to analyse 147, by referring it to our previously-attained arithmetical ideas, we shall find that it is, *theoretically*, the result of a more complicated process than that which suggests the idea of 203; and that, in every mode of resolving it into its elementary principles, the operation depends upon rules which are applicable to quantities higher than 1000.

The numbers 21 and 147 evidently hold the most obvious relation to each other; and, in every respect, 147 is the analogue of 21 in the general system. But it is unlike 21 in its peculiarity of being the common ratio of increase of the cabalistic series of 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, and 203. There is no recorded *empirical* proof of 147 being the *ratio* of any progression. It stands alone in the general scheme of cabalistic quantities; still, *in theory*, there is no other number which has so many characteristics of the model-type of an entire system.

We have already remarked that 21 may be accounted for by multiplication, as 7×3, the two corresponding factors of the first table, in which 7 appears as the *third* productive number, supposing we do not advance beyond 9 for elementary quantities; also, that if we do advance in the arithmetical progression, the *addition* of 10 and 11 (the two next numbers to 9) give the same result by addition.

Now $147=21\times7,=(10\times7)+(11\times7)$. The difference between 147 and 21, as regards both these modes of accounting for 147, is found in the application of 7 as a new multiplier, since $7\times3\times7$, or $7^2\times3$, or $10+11\times7=147$. And however we may arrange the categorical constituents of 147, we shall find that 7 is its principal element, unless it be produced by *addition*.

147 is producible by the addition of 90 and 57,—a process which is not less in harmony with our foregone discoveries about the basis attributes of 9 and 19; for $(9\times10)+(19\times3)=147$. This mode of accounting for its development, still gives it a more advanced position, in the general series of cabalistic numbers, than that of 203, because such a mode of analysis does not

occur to the mind until we discover the importance of 19 as a new point of departure in the scheme of 1197; and we are aware of the fact, that $57^2 = 3249 = (19 \times 3)^2$.

When 147 is thus connected with 9 and 19 as *multiplicands*, and with 10 and 3 as *multipliers*, we observe the first appearance of the *decuple* increase applied to 9, having previously discovered that $19 \times 10 = 190$, the sum total of all the numbers from 1 to 19; but not having yet found 9×10, or 90, as the self-suggested sub-combination in any arrangement, although 19 itself is producible by the *addition* of 9 and 10. Hitherto 5 has appeared as the constant correlative factor of 9; a similar constant relation between 19 and 3 does not suggest itself until we observe, that in all cases where 19 is the basis of a high number, it first appears in its triple form as 57, and ultimately as $19 \times 9 = 171$; where 7 is *medial* between *two similar* cyphers, an arrangement already noticed, as important in reference to chronological dates.

When considered under this mode of analysis, as $90 + 57$, 147 is a connecting link between two series or categories of mystical numbers; and its *theoretical* position in the general order, is that of an *intermediate* between 203 and 1197, although it seems to be more intimately in relation to the category based upon 19, than to that whose limit is 9.

But the *theoretical* relation between 147 and the great *political* number, 3249, is so remarkable, that it demands especial notice. There is an obvious analogy between the two formulas, $7 \times 3 \times 7$, and $19 \times 9 \times 19$, in which the arrangement is surprisingly similar. The *middle* term of the one formula, is the *square* of that of the other; and the *first* and *third* terms in both, are, respectively, the same. A simple, but general idea of order is applicable to both; which is, that the most perfect combination of *three* terms exhibits a multiplying process, where the original *basis* number is the last multiplier, and 3, or 3^2, is the *medial* term.

This principle is applicable to 7 as a basis; to 3, as a medial term; and to 7, as the last multiplier, in relation to the formula of $7 \times 3 \times 7 = 147$; also to 19, as a basis; to 3^2, as a medial term; and to 19, as a last multiplier, in relation to 3249.

Such a general rule cannot be apprehended by our gradually advancing intelligence, until we have observed the *practical* influence of numbers on events, and we have examined the most obvious *theoretical* method of accounting for their selection, under the presumption, that human intellect (the humble and remote copy of that Divine Intuitive Wisdom, which arranges all the events of the phenomenal universe) is capable of discovering the most elementary abstract processes of ideal arithmetical generation, and of determining the progressive development of ideas of *quantity* consequent upon the self-suggested influence of such abstract processes in the science of pure arithmetic.

In this examination, we do not perceive the same order, as that which results from our deriving our ideas of numbers from those of geometry, where our earliest notion of a perfect categorical number is 7. In pure arithmetic, 4 is the first idea of a *quantity of cyphers*, or distinct numbers, which constitute an obvious category; and *their joint value is* 10. Our first idea of a single notable number is that of 5, as the first in the new class of all subsequent quantities, which are distinguishable from 1, 2, 3, and 4, because they are internally productive under the process of multiplication. Patient observation alone enables us to ascertain *what* numbers prevail in nature, as the limits of fixed intervals of days or of years, between occurrences which hold some obvious relation to each other: but it is not until we have compared some of the known series of *cabalistic* numbers in reference to events, that the general influence of 7 by itself becomes evident. We then discover that 7 may be *theoretically* collated with 9 and 19: and that it is one of those general solvents in pure arithmetic, which suggest themselves to human reason, as we advance in our analysis of inevitable numerical certainties.

SECTION V.—*On the general prevalence of* 7, *as the great link of connexion between all the above-noticed mystical numbers.*

We have thus far accounted for the graduated development of certain numerical ideas in the human mind, commencing with those which are most simple, —only applying such arithmetical rules to the process as are the most obvious,—and treating the rules themselves as self-suggested notions, which are gradually and successively developed by our meditations upon the abstract properties of numbers.

We have found, that our *theoretical method* harmonises with the *empirical* observations of the cabalist, and that the numbers which really prevail in limiting the intervals between events, whose mutual relations are undeniable, would have been selected by a gradually *self-educated* human mind, if it had to determine *what* quantities were to be influential,—the general rule being, that the *progression*, both of processes and of quantities suggested by such processes, must constitute a regularly connected series, which commences with the idea of the *monad* as a numerical basis, and with that of the simple addition of monads as an arithmetical process.

This method of treating the problem presents us with the following arrangement of numbers, already accounted for, 33, 45, 77, 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, 203, 147, 1197, 1272, 1477, 3249,—a series of quantities, each of which has been found *empirically* by the observers of eventual intervals, to prevail practically in reference to extraordinary coincidences.

The theoretical *synthesis* of these numbers (in connexion with the progressive method of accounting for their successive conception in the human mind), enables us to ascertain that there is an *internal* link of relationship, which is not discovered until they have been all ascertained; and that this general expositor is the number 7.

For instance, the ideas of 10, as the total of units comprised in $1+2+3+4$; of 5, as the first *productive* number; of 9, as the first product of the squaring process in relation to the most obvious analysis of $6=3+3$; of 19, as a peculiarly harmonious quantity in relation to the decimal system, since all the numbers, from 1 to 19 inclusive, are equal to 19 multiplied by 10;—are all gradually conceived by the constructive faculty of our meditation, without assuming that 7 is an elementary or basis principle of the abstract arithmetical scheme.

It has been also shewn, that the cabalistic numbers 33, 45, and 77, are presented to the mind by a most simple process of reason, without suggesting 7 as a key in the attempt to explain why those three numbers are preferred to others. In the next series, which is based upon 77 as a new point of departure, the continuous additions of 21 suggest 7 in reference to 3, as one of the factors of 21, without attributing a special influence to 7 independently of 3, as a *connecting link* between the whole scheme of abstract cabalistic numbers.

The remarkable equation of $147=7\times3\times7$ is the first complete manifestation of the dominance of 7, which leads to the inquiry, whether it may not be possible to make the whole system reduce itself to a *septuple* principle. Even then, we must allow, that such a method of arrangement is less simple than that already adopted, because the idea of 7, as a *general* key, is not obvious until after we have discovered the influence of the common increment 21. Moreover, it is not possible to complete the reference of the whole cabalistic series to 7, without assuming that 21 is the extent of the original scale, instead of 19.

Still, it is satisfactory to find, that whether we fix upon 9 and 19 as important limits, or upon 7, 14, and 21, as corresponding terminals, the same cabalistic numbers will be suggested. The collation of the two methods tends to the confirmation of the hypothesis, that 33 and 77 would be selected by reason, as remarkable quantities in both methods of computation.

We have already seen that these two numbers are presented to our reason by a progressive and very simple method, and that 7 is only one of the elementary terms in the general computation. But, in the following table, this quantity appears as the key of the whole arrangement:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}6\times 2=12\\ 7\times 3=21\end{array}\right\}33$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}8\times 4=32\\ 9\times 5=45\end{array}\right\}77$$

4×7=28	1	Initial
	2	
	3	Subterminal
	4	Medial
	5	
	6	
	7	Terminal
11×7=77	8	Initial
	9	
	10	Subterminal
	11	Medial
	12	
	13	
	14	Terminal
18×7=126	15	Initial
	16	
	17	Subterminal
	18	Medial
	19	
	20	
	21	Terminal

33 × 7 = 231

The medial of the *entire* series is 11.

The three general terminals of each category consisting of 7 cyphers, are 7, 14, and 21.

The terminals of each category multiplied by their respective medials, are 7×4=28, 14×11 =154, 21×18=378.

The total of all the numbers, from 1 to 21 inclusive, is 231. Hence 378−231=147.

The three medials give 33 by addition, while the great medial of the whole progression, when multiplied by 7, produces 77.

Not only does 147, the important cabalistic number, result from the final adjustment of the above series, in relation to a septuple arrangement, but 33 is the total of the three medials; since 4+11+18=33, while the great medial, 11, multiplied by 7, produces 77.

Again, supposing the series to be divided into six categories, with three cyphers in each (excluding the medials), we find that the cyphers denominated *subterminals*, when multiplied by the next terminal, give

21, 140, 357, respectively; their respective factors being 3×7: 10×14: 17×21.

Of these quantities, the first (namely 21) is the numerative limit of the series; while the second (140) is important as a cabalistic quantity, in its absolute character; and together, they equal 161. The addition of the second and third quantities, namely, 140 and 357, gives 497 as a result; the difference between which number and the important 1197, is precisely 700, or $10^2 \times 7$.

Moreover, if we add 161×2 to 21+140+(357×2,) we attain a product of 1197.

In the marginal adjunct to the above table, 77 is the most conspicuous result, owing to its completely medial position. We have already seen that this quantity, in relation to 21, is the basis of the succession of 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, and 203; but this new method of considering its connexion with 7, suggests a most important corollary in reference to a continuous increase by 21; because 140, which is the product of the *subterminal* 10 multiplied by the *terminal* 14 (both being in the same septuple category), appears as the half of the common quantity, 280; which quantity has been previously noticed, as the result of the first medial, 4, being multiplied by the first terminal, 7, and the product being again multiplied by the next subterminal, 10: 4×7×10=280.

The same general scheme of *six* intervals, and of *seven* numbers, appears in reference to 280. We have already found that the great medial, 11, in the table at present under consideration, when multiplied by the dominant 7, gives 77 as the medial result: but the same number, 77, has a different position in the more elementary table with which we commenced our theoretical inquiry. Now if we include 77 in the series of numbers already accounted for by a progressive increase of 21, we meet with a new development of harmony between it and 203, the last of the series: their addition produces 280. That this is not accidental, may be proved by the following table, in which 140 is the *medial* of the seven numbers in question:

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}77\\ \left.\begin{array}{r}98\\ \left.\begin{array}{r}119\\ 140\\ 161\end{array}\right\}\\ 182\end{array}\right\}\\ 203\end{array}\right\}280=140\times 2.$$

We here observe the same relation between 98 and 182, as that between 119 and 161,—the respective total of either couplet being 280.

But the most remarkable proof of the importance of this sort of relationship, is discoverable *empirically.* The recorders of daily events have frequently remarked, that the above corresponding numbers in the same couplet, have precisely the same sort of influence; that is to say, the same sort of event may be expected to *recur* on the 77th, *or* the 203rd day; on the 98th, *or* the 182nd; on the 119th, *or* the 161st. And however incredible the statement may seem to those who have never thought upon the subject, it can be demonstrated by experience, that each couplet has its own special reference to the medial or terminal stage of a transaction: for instance, an undertaking may be *concluded* on the 77th or 203rd day from that of its commencement; while its termination will not be found to occur on the 98th or 182nd day, although some analogy, as regards changes during its continuous progress, may be remarked* after the lapse of that interval.

Among the many numbers which are observed to coincide with the intervals between the occurrence of similar or analogous events, it would be impossible to distinguish that whose quantity is likely to be dominant in any particular instance, unless some of them were observed to appertain to peculiar classes of mundane incidents. From the earliest periods, however, this precise apportionment of specialities has been traditional with augurs, astrologers, and others; and however superstitiously they may have applied their empirical rules, without any such analysis of their own ideas as has been attempted in the present essay on our most elementary numerical ideas, we are not warranted in hastily discarding traditions based upon the observations of ages, unless they be proved, by reason, to be unworthy of belief.

In the present instance we theoretically attain the notion of *analogous numbers*; and in the application of the discovery to the doctrine of predetermined intervals between common transactions, it is by no means unreasonable to suppose that numerical ideas, so obviously the counterparts of each other in the general scheme of pure arithmetic, should have been specifically apportioned by Divine Providence to similar sorts of events; and that the *ideas of initials*, *medials*, *and terminals*, in arithmetical processes, should be analogously represented in the phenomenal world, in which every transaction must have a beginning and an end, while its continuous progress must be diversified by various modes of change.

---

* The two corresponding numbers nearest the medial 140 (namely 119 and 161), prevail so obviously with regard to domestic affairs, that their influence is traditional in many quarters, without any notion of a theory on the matter. The troubles of private life, family quarrels, discharges of servants, and all those minor changes in a household, which make up the aggregate of its annoyances, without essentially interfering with its routine, may be considered as the ordinary *medial* events of an establishment, likely to have occupied a conspicuous place in "Pepys' Memoirs."

To have satisfied ourselves, that on account of their own abstract qualities, certain numbers would occur to the Divine reason as measures of intervals, in preference to others, is only a first and general assumption as regards the prevalence of universal harmony. The chemist has *specialised* the application of this doctrine in modern science, by supposing that certain sorts of matter are subordinate to certain definite numerical laws; and the basis of his notion about *isomeric* properties, depends upon his belief in this inevitable apportionment of special quantities. Our method of connecting a certain description of events with certain numbers, is one of the same character. We have discovered that many numbers limit the intervals between events; but it is a great step in advance of the general discovery, to ascertain, that among these selected numbers, there are some which prevail with respect to one class of events, some to another. By connecting theory with observation, we may hope to succeed at last in *reasonably* foreseeing future certainties, if not in detail and circumstantially, at least in a general appreciation of their classical characters.

It is only from a theoretical survey of the whole system of the internal harmony of numbers, that any rules of their adjustment to events can be ascertained; and, as this is the first occasion for noticing their analogous attributes, it is necessary to meditate carefully upon the important principle thus developed, in relation to 280 being the common quantity attained by respectively adding 77 to 203, 98 to 182, and 119 to 161.

By referring to the septuple division of an arithmetical progression up to 21, we observe that its first category comprises $1+2+3+4+5+6+7=28$; and by applying the elementary idea of 10, as a decuple power to 28, we attain the result of 280, the common quantity of these couplets; we also discover, that the same mode of considering the *decuple* multiplier as a general power, converts 14, the *terminal* of the second septuple category, into 140, the half of 280. In every respect, therefore, 140 is the numerical type of our idea of a medial *quality*, as well as of a notable medial quantity, in relation to the septuple arrangement.

It is difficult to imagine a more complete concordance than is exhibited by this synthesis. All the numbers from 1 to 7 inclusive, equal 28. The *medial* number 4 multiplied into 7 (the *terminal* of the *first* septuple category), also produces 28. The application of the decuple principle develops 280. The *common number* of the two corresponding quantities, which result from 21 being progressively added to 77, is 280. The half of 280 is 140, and the *terminal* of the *second* septuple category is 14, which, by the application of 10 as a multiplier, produces 140.

Again, as regards 147,—the numerical principle of the categorical division 7, when multiplied by 3, the quantity of the categories themselves, gives 21 as a result; and when this result is multiplied by 7, the product is 147.

Moreover, the *second* septuple category of $8+9+10+11+12+13+14=77$, the point of departure for an increase in the ratio of 21 up to 203, which is the number *empirical* observation has fixed upon as the limit of this order of cabalistic quantities. And it is no less remarkable, that the aggregate of the quantities included in the *second* and *third* septuple categories, from 8 to 21 inclusive, is also 203; while $203+77=280$.

Now let us proceed in the application of this septuple mode of analysis to 1197, which is the evident basis both of 1274, in reference to the additional 77, and of 1477, as regards the further addition of 203 to 1274.

We find :

First. That if 28 (which is the collective sum of all the numbers from 1 to 7 inclusive) be the divisor of 1197, the result will be $28 \times 42+21=1197$.

Secondly. That if 77 (which is the collective sum of the numbers from 8 to 14 inclusive) be the divisor of 1197, the result will be $77 \times 15+42=1197$.

Thirdly. That if 126 (which is the collective sum of all the numbers from 15 to 21 inclusive) be the divisor of 1197, the result will be $126 \times 9+63=1197$.

In these three calculations the *added* balances are respectively and successively 21, 42, and 63,—where we find 3, 3×2, and 3^2, as multipliers, *in relation to 7 as the multiplicand*, since $7 \times 3=21$, $7 \times (3 \times 2)=42$, and $7 \times 3^2=63$.

Again, if we divide 1197 by the aggregate of $28 + 77 + 126$, or by 231, the result will be $231 \times 5+42$, in which 3×2 *in relation to* 7, *is the* *remainder*, precisely as we have first found it to be in the operation of dividing 1197 by the *medial* or second septuple aggregate of 77.

The general result is evidence, that 7 is the connecting link of the cabalistic system in relation to 3, its double or its square; not only as regards those prevalent numbers which advance from 77 to 203 in the ratio of an increase by 21, but in their harmonious connexion with 1197, and its adjuncts, which also depend upon 77 and 203 being added to 1197. Nevertheless, it should be remembered, that 19 is the most simple basis of 1197, in the formula of $19\times3^2\times7$, where the same early ideas of numbers prevail as multipliers; and that 171, or 19×3^2, is a new point of departure in regard to the above-noticed quantities above 1000, as 77 is in reference to those below 1000.

A careful examination of the harmonious connexion between such observed numbers, suggests another simple arrangement in reference to 1197. We have already found that 10 is one of our earliest ideas of a categorical quantity, as the first aggregate of the *non-productive* numbers; also, that 119 is obviously important in the theoretical system. The combination of these two ideas suggests that of 1190: the addition of 7 completes the notion of the identical quantity 1197. The same mode of adding 7 to 140, suggests the number 147: but both these important quantities may be referred to a simpler elementary mode of accounting for their powerful prevalence in the mystical system. Still it is satisfactory to demonstrate, that 7 in this form of a mere added quantity of units, develops an harmonious result.

A more complicated harmony is found in the attempt to blend the four high numbers 1197, 1274, 1477, and 3249, in one aggregate, whose total is 7197. Its analysis exhibits the relations of 7 to 10^3 as 7000, leaving a remainder of 197, which is precisely that of the excess above 1000 in 1197, although there are *four* distinct unequal quantities combined without any intention of producing such a result, in the higher quantity of 7197. Hence we are warranted in assuming that 197 is important independently of its appearing as the additional supplement of 1000 and 7000.

Now $197 = 19 \times 10 + 7$. The same rule prevails here, as in the previous instance of $1197 = 119 \times 10 + 7$. The *decuple* multiplier and the additional 7 are the necessary adjuncts of 19 and of 119.

However we may analyse these higher numbers, 7 is a prevalent idea. In relation to 7197, it is the basis quantity; when 7 is multiplied by 10^3, the product is 7000; when 19 is multiplied by 10, the product is 190; when the basis sum 7 is added to 7190, the result is 7197. We thus find that there is a perfect analogy between $(7 \times 10^3) + (19 \times 10) + 7$, and $19 \times 9 \times 7$.

It is still more remarkable, that 980 (the total of 77, 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, 203) should be divisible by 7; since $980 \div 7 = 140$, which product is not only the medial quantity of the *seven* numbers constituting 980, but is itself represented by $7 \times 2 \times 10$; while 147 is the total of $7 \times 3 \times 7$.

The process of the *cubic* operation in arithmetic, is the highest which is applicable to *cabalistic* numbers; and it is only developed by analysis in reference to 10 and 7. That such should be the *theoretical* rule, is in accordance with the principle, that the more complicated processes are not influential as *primary* ideas in the determination of such quantities.

Hitherto, we have not discovered the cubic mode of multiplication as a practical solvent, except in relation to 10, where the product is 1000; and it is only suggested in reference to the *sum total* of those quantities each of which exceeds 1000; but in this case, it appears in connexion with 7.

The cubic process, however, can be applied to 7 alone, as the solvent of a number which has been observed to prevail under peculiar conditions. $343=7^3$. The interval between the *prevision* of the death of an individual and its fulfilment, frequently occupies that number of days;* and in reference to history, 7^3, or

---

* In a notable instance, a person in sound health, perfectly unconscious of the import of her dream, had an intimation of the incidents of her funeral. Friends buried in a vault adjoining that in which her body was finally deposited, the timber-merchant by whom the wood of the coffin was to be imported, and many trivial facts, were all represented to her imagination, in an allegorical mode, and were mentioned by the dreamer, in the author's presence, without the least surmise of their meaning, to a person whose previous study in the mystical science enabled him to apprehend the prevision. His experience in the interpretation of allegories, convinced him that the dreamer was forewarned of her own death. He did not explain it to her, but made a memorandum of the dream; and she died on the 343rd day afterwards: every incident of her dream was described by herself as a successive event in a sort of festival, in which the tenants of the neighbouring vault participated, and to which she was driven by the timber-merchant in a richly ornamented carriage.

The number 7, in connexion with 4, has been frequently found to coincide with the period of the death of an individual, after a prevision of the event, if during each successive seventh night the same occurrence was suggested to the sleeping thoughts of his or her intimate acquaintances. The *medial* and *terminal* of the first septuple series are 4 and 7.

343 years, will be found by inspection, to be the last or *terminating* interval in many a continuous series of periods, as regards the destinies of a country or a dynasty.

In every respect, 7 is a great mystical number. In combination with 3, it gives 21 as the *ratio* of increase; in combination with 4, which is *its own medial* quantity, it has various properties, as the solvent of a number; in relation to the cubic process, either alone or in combination with other numbers (more especially with 10) it indicates some obvious conclusion of a specific system of activity in the physical world.

SECTION VI.—*On the theoretical importance of* 5 *and* 10, *in relation to* 9 *and* 19.

The peculiar influence of any *medial* number in a category has been frequently noticed in the preceding pages; but hitherto no remark has been made upon its development in regard to the decimal or quinary mode of computation, as bearing upon any higher quantity than 9 and 19,—such as 29 or 99, in which 9 and some multiple of 10 are connected.

We have found, that the ideas of 5 and 10 are our earliest notions of number, 5 being the first internally productive quantity, and 10 being the total of the unproductive quantities,—the one being the medial of 9, the other being that of 19. Also, that if all the numbers, from 1 to 9, be combined by addition, the result is the same as if 9 were multiplied by its medial, 5; and that if all those from 1 to 19 be added together in the same manner, the total will equal the product of 19 multiplied by its medial, 10.

This harmony may be infinitely extended, as follows:—

ADDITION. MEDIALS.
1 to 9= 9 × 5= 45
1 to 19=19 × 10= 190
1 to 29=29 × 15= 435
1 to 39=39 × 20= 780
1 to 49=49 × 25=1225
1 to 59=59 × 30=1770
1 to 69=69 × 35=2415
1 to 79=79 × 40=3160
1 to 89=89 × 45=4005
1 to 99=99 × 50=4950

The general rule is applicable to any total of numbers in a continuous arithmetical series. If the total of all the successive numbers, from 1 to 17, for instance, be *added* together, the result will be 153, which is equal to the product of 17 *multiplied* by its medial, 9. But where the given number is an even one, and it can have *no medial* in the arithmetical series, we shall find a modification of the same harmony, which may be exemplified in the following formulas:—

1 to 16=136=16 × 8 + 8
1 to 18=171=18 × 9 + 9
1 to 20=210=20 × 10 + 10

There can be no *medial* number of transition between two categories, which constitute an even quantity of cyphers: in this case, the *terminals of both halves*, when multiplied into each other, produce a total which is the same as that obtained by the above mode of addition, *minus* the difference of the quantity expressed by the first of the two respective *terminal* cyphers. The deficiency in the above formulas is respectively made up by the addition of 8, 9, and 10, to 16×8, 18×9, and 20×10.

It is evident, that if these formulas were each transposed, we should find the prevalence of the general principle already noticed, namely, that where three elements are thus involved, the first and third are the same numbers; because $8 \times 16 + 8 = 136$; $9 \times 18 + 9 = 171$; and $10 \times 20 + 10 = 210$,—although the arrangements would be less perfect than those of $7 \times 3 \times 7$, and $19 \times 9 \times 19$, in which not only the first and third figures are the same, but the processes are similar. In $8 \times 16 + 8$, the first process is that of *multiplication;* but the other is that of *addition.*

In the analysis of 1197 (the point of departure of the higher cabalistic numbers), we have found 171, or 19×9, as a basis; and we now see that the same quantity, 171, is attainable by the formula of $18 \times 9 + 9$, which produces the same result as the addition of all the numbers, in the regular arithmetical series, from 1 to 18 inclusive. We thus attain the notion of a new sort of relation between the *even* quantity, 18, where there is no *medial* number; and the uneven, 19, where the medial is 10. But instead of 10, 9 (which is remarkable, independently of its being the half of 18) appears as the multiplier of 19; and it is evident that the principle of the *medial* does not prevail in this instance.

9 is important on two accounts: it is the counterpart of 5, as the *fifth* internally prolific number,—5 being the first. It is also notable as the first *square* uneven number: we have already seen that 4 is only the type of the square.*

The following arrangement completely exemplifies the relation between the *later* and the next *earlier* number, while it places the first manifestation of an adjustment at *that* point in the series which determines the limit between 4, the *last unproductive* quantity, and 5, the first *productive* number; suggesting the idea of 10, in relation both to 4 and 5, as that of a common category.

---

* Notwithstanding the absence of any evidence that 8 is of importance, practically, in the determination of intervals, we may construct a progressive table, in which it holds the same relation to 2^2, as that of 18 to 3^2, where the total of all the added numbers

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1+2+3+4 \quad = 10\\ 5\times2= 10\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}\text{Added numbers from } 1 \text{ to } 6 \quad = 21\\ 7\times3= 21\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 8 \quad = 36\\ 9\times4= 36\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 10 \quad = 55\\ 11\times5= 55\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 12 \quad = 78\\ 13\times6= 78\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 14 \quad =105\\ 15\times7=105\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 16 \quad =136\\ 17\times8=136\end{array}\right\}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \text{ to } 18 \quad =171\\ 19\times9=171\end{array}\right\}$$

from 1 to 8, equals 9×2^2, in the same manner as the total of all those from 1 to 18 equals 19×3^2. The table is as follows:

$1 \text{ to } 8 = 36 = 9\times2^2$

$1 \text{ to } 18 = 171 = 19\times3^2$

$1 \text{ to } 32 = 528 = 33\times4^2$

$1 \text{ to } 50 = 1275 = 51\times5^2$

$1 \text{ to } 72 = 2628 = 73\times6^2$

$1 \text{ to } 98 = 4851 = 99\times7^2$

The ratio of the progression is determined by the order of the numbers squared in the last column. No observations have proved, that any of the high quantities thus produced, are cabalistically powerful; but there are some curious harmonies in this table, and the appearance of 9, 19, and 33, in one column, and of 50, 72, and 98, in the other, is worthy of notice. The fact, that any number multiplied by the half of its immediate predecessor in the regular arithmetical series, should give a product equal to the total of all the numbers from 1 to that preceding number, is a development of harmony not hitherto remarked. For instance, 99×49, equals the

We thus discover, that the multiplying process, applied systematically to the *later* number in a series, brings back the idea of the more elementary process of *combining* the values of all the previously-estimated units with that of the next early number, in one sum. But it is not the least interesting corollary of this discovery, that, as the first possible multiplier of *five* is *two*, we are obliged to combine 1, 2, 3, 4, in 10, with the object of finding a *counterpart* for 5×2; which will again become the first category in a new mode of adjustment, and tend further to the support of the opinion, that 10 is our earliest notion of a categorically combined aggregate of distinct numbers; while the next term, 5, follows, in a regular succession of ordinals, as the first integer capable of undergoing that sort of analysis, which suggests the idea of an *internally* productive quality.

In reference to the empirically-discovered cabalistic numbers, neither 10 nor 5 has any influence as one of them; but they may both appear as arithmetical *ratios* of increase, when they are applied to the processes by which 9 and 19 are found to be the points of departure, or the basis quantities; and they are both, respectively, *medial* in relation to 9 and to 19, for 5 is the middle term in the category of 9, and 10 has the same position in that of 19.

Having thus cursorily attempted to ascertain what quantities first suggest themselves in the analysis of our arithmetical ideas, and to determine their relative theoretical importance, let us proceed to the practical verification of the allegations, that such quantities

---

total of all the numbers from 1 to 98 inclusive, for the same reason that 19×9 equals all the numbers from 1 to 18.

really prevail in the occurrence of events. We shall find 10^2 (the secular number) remarkably dominant as the adjunct of 119 and 161, either by itself, as the measure of a single century, or when it is multiplied by 3, 4, or 7.*

---

* The connexion between 9 and 10 will be frequently exemplified with respect to 33 and 57, as numbers belonging to the same series. Their total is 90; and the same mode of tabular arrangement as that demonstrated in page 34, will develope a remarkably harmonious scheme, in which 21, 33, 45, 57, 69, and 81, are the counterparts of 98, 119, 140, 161, 182, and 203, where the analogous numbers 119 and 161 give a total of 280. The basis of that series is 77, and the ratio of increase is 21. In this case the basis is 9, while the ratio of increase is 12. Upon referring to the first table in the preceding chapter, we observe 12+21=33; and as that is the tabular exposition of our earliest ideas of combination, it is satisfactory to find 12 in relation to 9, holding the same relation to each other, as that of 21 to 77.

If we adopt the same method of adding the basis number to the column of products, we obtain the same notion of analogous numbers, in 9+81=21+69=33+57=90, as in 77+203=98+182=119+161=280, with the more complete harmony of 9^2 being the *terminating* number of the series based upon 9, while the *medial* of the seven cyphers is 45, or 9×5. Hitherto we have treated 57, as 19×3, and the constituent of a category based upon 19. The collation of the two schemes is further evidence of the perfect adjustment of the whole theoretical system, and the frequent *practical* prevalence of 57, either by itself, or in connexion with 10, as regards historical intervals, will be noticed in the next chapter.

ORIGINAL TABLE.				
1	9		77	
2	9 + 12 = 21		77 + 21 = 98	
3	21 + 12 = 33		98 + 21 = 119	
4	33 + 12 = 45	90 = 45×2	119 + 21 = 140	280 = 140×2
5×1= 5	45 + 12 = 57		140 + 21 = 161	
6×2=12	57 + 12 = 69		161 + 21 = 182	
7×3=21	9^2 = 69 + 12 = 81		182 + 21 = 203	
8×4=32				
9×5=45				
45				

CHAPTER III.

ON THE CERTAINTY THAT THE INTERVALS OF YEARS OR DAYS BETWEEN IMPORTANT EVENTS ARE MEASURABLE BY THE SAME NUMBERS AS THOSE WHICH ARE SELF-SUGGESTED TO THE HUMAN MIND AS THE EARLIEST AND MOST INFLUENTIAL IN PURE ARITHMETIC.

SECTION I.—*Historical proofs, in reference to the Roman, Persian, and Arabian Empires.*

THE influence of certain numbers in preference to others, as regards the intervals between notable events which hold an obvious relation to each other, has been hitherto treated as a fact in the previous part of this essay, without any endeavour to verify the assumption by referring to history. Let us now proceed to the chronological proofs of the allegation—first, with respect to the quantity of years intervening between momentous consecutive occurrences, which have been recorded by the historian ; and afterwards, to the number of days between some of those remarkable political events which have happened in our own time.

We have already demonstrated, that years and days are the portions of eternal Time, which should be philosophically considered as *standard units* in any such appropriation of abstract numbers, so far as the events occurring upon our planet are concerned, although the same numbers might be applied to other years and other days, if we could observe occurrences in other heavenly bodies. This idea of a basis or practical equivalent of the abstract unit, is suggested by two of the most general astronomical phenomena which prevail in Nature, in relation to Time.

Having thus attained the notion of a *temporal* equivalent of the unit, our next preliminary step will be, to determine the synthesis of terrestrial events themselves, or to arrange them in a general system, where their relative importance and co-ordination will be as obvious, as those of years and days. The same sort of classification as that which divides the objects of any particular science into orders, genera, and species, or into leading classes, and subordinate divisions and subdivisions of such classes, presents us with the idea of a primary distribution of the earth's surface in great natural portions, such as those of sea and land, and of distinct masses of land inhabited by the human race. The synthetical geographer, who considers the planet as the mere arena of events, values the prevalence of any nation or tribe over others, as a fact of less importance in the scheme, than that some notable region of the earth should be the seat of predominating political power; and the geographical historian, in dealing with consecutive events, speaks of an empire as a territorial system, which is of more consequence in his view of the balance of power, than the migration of the ancestors of a nation from one part of the world to another. The great contests in olden times between Europe and Asia are more remarkable than those between various Asiatic or various European nations.

One of the most important struggles of this geographical character, was the long continued contest between the Roman empire and the successive masters of Western Asia, which lasted from the time when Crassus was defeated by the Parthians, till Constantinople became the capital of the Turkish empire. During that interval of 1510 years, we shall find that the leading events occurred at intervals already suggested in our theoretical system. The numbers 33, 77, 203, 1197, and 1477, each determine the quantity of years between notable occurrences of this long contest between Europe and Asia. 57, 570, 570×2, and 280, also appear in reference to its remarkable incidents.

The triumphs of Asia over Europe were never more signal, than when the emperor Valerian was made the prisoner of Sapor, and afterwards when Constantinople became the capital of the Turks. The first event occurred in 260—the other in 1457—the interval is 1197 years. The last remaining shadow of the Roman empire disappeared when Constantinople was taken by Mahomet II in 1453, and the emperor lost his life. Four years afterwards, in 1457, the Asiatic emperor removed from Adrianople to his new conquest, which has ever since been the capital of the Turkish empire; and before the conclusion of 1458, Athens and the few remaining districts in ancient Greece which resisted his arms, were brought under subjection. 1457—260=1197.

But the coincidence in this instance is not limited to the number 1197. The recovery of the Roman ensigns which were originally captured by the Parthians when Crassus lost his life, occurred exactly 280 years before the wretched end of Valerian, or 1477 years before Constantinople became the capital of the Osmanlee Turks. Still further back, we discover the same marvellous accordance with the cabalistic scheme in the date of Crassus's defeat, which occurred exactly 33 years before Tiberius (during the reign of Augustus) recovered the trophies of that disgrace. In this parallelism between the cabalistic numbers whose *rationale* is explained by our theory, and the striking incidents of the contest between the prevalent European and Asiatic powers, we find the numbers 33, 280, 1197, and 1477, as the measures of notable intervals.

The first great contest between these powers, when Crassus was defeated, occurred in 53 B.C. The recovery of the Roman ensigns happened 20 B.C. Valerian was defeated A.D. 260. Constantinople, the last residence of the real representative of the old Roman emperors, became the capital of Mahomet II, A.D. 1457.

In addition to these dates, we discover that on the *fourteenth anniversary* of the defeat of Crassus, Pacorus (the eldest son of the Parthian king Orodes) was himself defeated and slain by Ventidius. The coincidence was remarked by the historians of the time.

The only other date required to complete the verification of the theory, that 1477 is the last number of a triple category in which 1197 is the first, through the joint intervention of 77 and 203—(we have already noticed 280 their sum total) is 57 A.D., because that would divide the number 280 into its *theoretical* bipartite portions of 77 and 203. In that year, during the reign of Nero, a war broke out between Rome and Parthia, about the succession to the throne of Armenia, in which the Roman general prevailed.

All these occurrences may be arranged in the following order with the object of exhibiting their respective intervals.

1. From the defeat of Crassus to the recovery of the ensigns, 53 to 20 B.C.	33	
2. From the recovery of the ensigns to the struggle between the Romans, under Nero, and the Parthians, for the nomination to the throne of Armenia, 20 B.C. to 57 A.D.	77	1477
3. From the war during the reign of Nero to the death of Valerian, 57 to 260 A.D.	203	
4. From the death of Valerian to the residence of the Turkish emperors at Constantinople, 260 to 1457 A.D.	1197	
	1510	

Again, as regards the subdivision of the quantity 1197, we discover other notable developments of the same sort of harmony, when we examine dates bearing upon the continued contests between Rome and Persia. The most remarkable occurrence in the wars between the later Roman and Persian empires, was the defeat of the Persians by Heraclius, in A.D. 627. This was one of the most eventful times in history. Constantinople, the heart of the Roman empire, was assaulted by the Avars and Persians, while the central portions of the dominions of the Persian sovereign, Chosroes, were invaded by the Roman emperor, Heraclius, in person. The prophet Mahomet and his Arabs were then commencing their great mission in the events of the world. The results of the battle of Nineveh were, the safety of the Roman empire as against Persia, the downfall of Chosroes II, and a temporary restoration of the equilibrium between the European and fire-worshipping Asiatic powers, which was about to be disturbed by the monotheistic Mahometans, whose subsequent influence overshadowed Asia and Africa, and threatened the subjugation of Europe.

It is worthy of remark, that from A.D. 57, when the Romans hindered the Parthians from exercising the supremacy in Armenia, to A.D. 627, when Heralius at the battle of Nineveh avenged the ruin of Valerian, there is an interval of 570 years. The number 570, in the theoretical arrangement, results from multiplying 57 by 10,—10 being one of the most obvious multiplying powers in the abstract system,—while 57 itself is constantly suggested in that system as 19 × 3, or 9 + (12 × 4). It is still more surprising that if 627 be subtracted from 1197, the remainder should be precisely 570. But it is a most wonderful coincidence, that when 57 is deducted from 1197, the remainder should be 1140, or twice 570,—more especially when we remember that this 1140 is the exact interval between the successful resistance of Rome to the suzerainté of Parthia in reference to the throne of Armenia during the reign of Nero, and when the same country of Armenia was the basis of Heraclius's more completely successful operations against Persia itself. Neither must it be forgotten, that while 1140, or twice 570, is the interval between the *European* successes, 1197 years intervened between the two great instances of *Asiatic* success, exemplified in the destruction of the Roman emperor Valerian, and the establishment of the Asiatic Turks in the last capital of the Roman emperors. The number 57, which is the difference between 1140 and 1197, is thus not only theoretically important in the attempt to account for the prevalence of mystical ideas of quantity, but in this case it denotes *the year of the Christian era*, when the Roman success occurred under Nero. There are several other instances which make the birth of Christ a great epoch in the history of the world, as a point of convergence or departure in reference to previous or subsequent events.

Moreover, it is of importance in the philosophical view of coincidences, that while the prophet Mahomet was endeavouring to promote his religion, boldly calling on Chosroes to abandon the worship of fire, and predicting to him that if he did not, he should be overthrown by the Romans (notwithstanding the siege of Constantinople by his Persians and the Avars), Heraclius advanced, contrary to all expectations, into the holy district of the Magians, and desecrated the reputed natal spot and most venerated temple of Zoroaster, the prophet of the fire-worshippers. The three great religions of the civilized world were in conflict. That of Zoroaster was degraded by Heraclius, and shortly afterwards extinguished by that of the Mahometans, which replaced it in Western Asia.

In this contest between Europe (represented by the Roman empire, from the first triumvirate to the reign of Heraclius) and Asia, with the country of Persia as its influential centre (although the Parthian Arsacides and the last Persian dynasty of the Sassanides succeeded each other as sovereign powers in that supremacy), the limits are clearly defined. The passions of avarice and ambition in Crassus promoted the commencement of the "conflict" between the Roman and Persian empires, which, as Gibbon says, "was prolonged from the death of Crassus to the reign of Heraclius." The avarice as well as the ambition of Chosroes were no less insatiable. The Parthian conqueror insulted the head of Crassus by ordering molten gold to be poured down his throat. Chosroes was starved to death by being imprisoned by his son in his own treasury, amidst his heaps of gold.

But the European and Asiatic struggle was not ended by the destruction of Chosroes. The eastern seat of the Roman empire was still the fortress of Europe against the Asiatic Arabs and the Asiatic Turks, until Mahomet II established himself at Constantinople. The prolonged struggle was maintained by the empire of Rome in its various phases of imperial rule, against the Parthians, the later Persians, the Arabs, and the Turks, for 1510 years. As soon as the danger from Persia was removed, by the death of Chosroes II, a new enemy to the Christian power advanced with gigantic strides from the unimportant Arabian towns of Mecca and Medina.

The message of Mahomet to Chosroes, when the Persian was in the fulness of his insolent pride, commanding him to abstain from the practices of the Magian religion, and that from Chosroes himself to Heraclius, ordering him to become a convert from the tenets of the Christian religion to those of Zoroaster, were almost simultaneous. The defiance between the Christian and Magian sovereigns, and that between the Arabian prophet and the Persian king, were events not only analogous, but almost similar. Within a few years, the fatal prophecy of Mahomet was accomplished. Notwithstanding the alliance between the Avars and the Persians, and their beleaguering Constantinople, the Roman emperor overthrew Chosroes in 627. Five years afterwards, the Arabs obtained possession of Damascus; and within three years from that success of the new Asiatic power, Heraclius ceased to hold dominion in Syria. In the *fourteenth* year of the Hegira, the Mahometans were masters of the Syrian provinces of the Roman empire.

They not only replaced the Persians in maintaining the Asiatic influence upon the soil of Asia itself, but (after the European Romans had been the masters of Egypt for 670 years) the Arabs restored the ascendancy of Asia in Africa. The short interval of four years from their conquest of Syria, found them in possession of Alexandria, which fell into their hands in 640. Heraclius died in the following year, after as eventful a reign as any in the records of the earlier Roman empire. Not only was he engaged in mortal conflict with the champions of the expiring Magian and the nascent Mahometan influences, but he was the successor of Phocas, during whose brief exercise of temporal authority, the famous edict was promulgated, which has ever since enabled the Bishop of Rome to assume a supremacy more absolute and tyrannical than that of any spiritual system recorded in history.

The new Asiatic influence of the Mahometans advanced in its conquests after the death of Heraclius. In 647, within an interval of *seven* years, it swept over the whole southern coast of the Mediterranean, and added Mauritania to the Arabian empire. *Four-*

teen years after this subjection of the Roman provinces of Egypt and Africa to the immediate successors of Mahomet, Moawiah, the first of the long line of the Ommeyidan hereditary caliphs, commenced his reign, in 661 A.D., the 39th year of the Hegira. The centre of his power was at Damascus. His successors extended their empire into Europe. Spain became tributary, and France itself was only liberated from the same entire subserviency by the victory of Charles Martel at Tours, in 732, which saved the Christian religion and the liberties of Europe. In the whole history of the world there never was a more important time than that which elapsed from *the Hegira* 622 to 732, an interval of 110 years. The immense empire of the caliphs, although occasionally disturbed by intestine troubles, was at last the compendium of more than all the dominions of Darius Hystaspes. The whole northern coast of Africa, Spain, and Portugal, and a considerable portion of France, were in subjection, when the battle of Tours checked its further advance in Europe.

We have already found 1510 to be the great interval of the continued conflict between Europe and Asia, from the defeat of Crassus to the establishment of the Turks at Constantinople. This minor quantity of 110 years, being deducted from 1510, leaves 1400 years as the remaining period. Both numbers are remarkable in our theoretical system, because $110=11\times10$. $1400=14\times10^2$. But this is not the only instance in which such a bipartite division of 1510 is suggested by events in relation to this struggle between Europe and Asia. The same interval of 110 years occurred between the first catastrophe, namely, the defeat of

Crassus in 53 B.C., and the re-establishment of the Roman supremacy with regard to Armenia during the reign of Nero, in A.D. 57. Each of these periods of 110 years begins with an Asiatic date of honour or reverence (for such were the Parthian victory and the celebrated Hegira), and ends with an event which redounded to the fame of the European portion of the world. *Per contra*, the interval of 1400 years, from the success under Nero to the establishment of the Asiatic monarch at Constantinople, begins with the European victory, but ends with the Asiatic triumph of the Turkish emperor making the imperial Roman capital the head-quarters of his power.

Let us now proceed to the political relations between *Africa*, Asia, and Europe. Egypt was the type of Africa, as Persia was that of Asia in ancient history. A critical inquiry into the religious and mythological systems of these two countries developes the two opposite principles of a more or less pure Monotheism as regards Persia, and of a doctrine of Polytheism (even with respect to the mystical corruptions of the monotheistic principle in those polemical disputations of theologians at Alexandria, which were based on the pure doctrines of the Saviour) as regards Egypt. The soil of Egypt has always been a prolific birth-place of Polytheism, and of those mythical dialectics which end in Polytheistical superstitions.

The first entire conquest of Egypt by an Asiatic power, whose date is fixed with precision, is that of the Persian Cambyses in 525 B.C. After a series of struggles with the Persians, in which the natives were occasionally victorious, or defeated, it fell into the hands of Alexander, and eventually became the realm of the Ptolemies. They were succeeded by the Romans, who were at last driven out by the Arabs. For a short time it became the seat of the real Arab empire, when Saladin was its sovereign, although the Caliph of Bagdad was still the nominal representative of Mahomet. The Arabian power was overthrown by the Mongols in Asia in 1258 ; but they were checked by the Mamelukes, and the Mongols never obtained possession of Egypt, where the Mameluke kings maintained their rule till the Turkish Selim conquered the country, and made it a province of the Ottoman empire in 1517.

The great events of Egypt, from 525 B.C. to A.D. 1517, are :

1.	Its conquest by Cambyses	525 B.C.
2.	Its conquest by Alexander, and the foundation of Alexandria	331 B.C.
3.	Its existence as a separate State under the Ptolemies	323 B.C.
4.	The death of Cleopatra, when it became part of the Roman empire.	30 B.C.
5.	Its conquest by the Arabs	640 A.D.
6.	The building of Grand Cairo, which became the provincial capital under the first hereditary caliph, Moawiah	670 to 672 A.D.
7.	Its becoming the centre of the Fatimite caliphate when occupied by Moez . .	968 A.D.
8.	Its predominance as the great Arabian power under Saladin	1171 1193 A.D.
9.	Its independence under the Mameluke kings	1250 A.D.
10.	Its conquest by Selim	1517 A.D.

In comparing these dates we find that from the conquest of Cambyses, when Asia absorbed Egypt in 525 B.C., to its complete agglomeration in the empire of the first *hereditary* caliph, Moawiah, when Grand

Cairo became the provincial capital in A.D. 672, the interval was precisely 1197 years. There is a striking analogy in these two events. Cambyses and Moawiah were in the position of undisturbed possessors of the Asiatic supremacy attained by their predecessors; for Cyrus and the Medina caliphs had established their respective empires by a succession of rapid conquests. They both assumed the pomp of irresponsible sovereigns, who relied upon the founders of their empires for the prestige of their authority; and they both struck at the traditional feelings of the Egyptians in their policy.

This period of 1197 years includes the time of the European domination of the Greeks and Romans, as well as that of the early Persians, and of the struggles between them and the Egyptians. It is precisely the interval between the first permanent conquest of Egypt, when the downfall of the Pharaohs was attended with a national degradation which did not occur in the subjection of Egypt to the Greeks or Romans, and the fixed establishment of the Mahometan system, which has ever since been the governing principle of the country.

In all the catastrophes of Egypt there is an extraordinary manifestation of cabalistic numbers in reference to dates. In her contest with the successors of Cambyses, we find that her temporary independence was resumed 111 years after his conquest; but that it lasted only 63 years. Again, Persia only held Egypt as a province for 19 years after its second subjection, until Alexander wrested it from the last Persian sovereign.

525, 414, 323, are all curiously artificial combinations of cyphers*; but they are salient in the history of Egypt as regards the Christian era. In 525 B.C., Cambyses became her master. In 414 B.C. she shook off the yoke, and was governed by a native sovereign for 63 years. In the year 323 B.C. the dynasty of the Ptolemies commenced its reign. Cleopatra died, and Egypt became a Roman province in the year 30 B.C., which gives a duration of 293 years to the Ptolemaic dynasty. But the substitution of the Roman for the Greek supremacy did not interfere with the predominance of European power, and we may therefore consider the interval between 323 B.C. and 640 A.D., when that power was subverted by the Asiatic Arabs, as a continuous period of 963 years, where the number 3, its double, and its square, are most harmoniously arranged in relation to 10 and 10^2.

An important year in relation to Egypt was that in which Moawiah, the *first hereditary caliph*, founded Grand Cairo, the seat of his Egyptian administration. This occurred in 670 A.D., the *medial* year of his reign. He reigned 19 years. The addition of 1197 to 670 suggests 1867 A.D. as the theoretically prospective end of a system which commenced with the fulness of Moawiah's power. Many other collations of dates point to 1866 as a year which is to be as remarkable in the history of the religious world as in the political destinies of the whole human race.

---

* This arrangement coincides with the abstract idea of the *first* and *third* factor being the same in the combination of three terms, already found in the theoretical system of numbers, where $7 \times 3 \times 7 = 147$, and $19 \times 9 \times 19 = 3249$. Chosroes invaded Egypt in 616 A.D., another instance of the same dominant rule of arithmetical order, in relation to the Christian era.

Another important time in the history of Egypt was when the Fatimite dynasty was supplanted by Saladin, who became its virtual monarch, and commenced his imperial career. This occurred in A.D. 1169, between 1197 and 1198 years after the death of Cleopatra, when Egypt became a Roman province. It is true that the Fatimite dynasty did not *formally* end till A.D. 1171, three years afterwards; but the entire conquest of Egypt in 1168 by Saladin and his uncle Shirakoh reduced the last Fatimite to a nullity, and transferred all power to the conquerors. Shirakoh died in the year of the conquest, and although Saladin continued to exercise a nominal vice-royalty for some time, he was virtually sovereign of Egypt from A.D. 1168. Cleopatra's death took place in the year 30 B.C. Again, Saladin occupied Damascus and assumed the title of sultan in A.D. 1174. From that period until 1517, when the Mameluke dynasty was overturned by the Turks, and Egypt became a province of the Ottoman empire, was exactly 343 years, a number theoretically of the greatest importance as 7^3, and constantly occurring under observations of coincidences, as one peculiarly *terminal.* From A.D. 1517 to A.D. 1860 there will be another period of 7^3 years; and if we add to this 343, the original number 7, we find A.D. 1867, the prospective date already noticed, as suggested by calculating from the foundation of Grand Cairo in A.D. 670, and adding 1197 years. Finally, as regards the epoch of Saladin, if we deduct 1168 from 1868, the remainder is precisely *seven* centuries.

We have already seen that a previous cycle of 1197 years had elapsed between the conquest of Egypt by

Cambyses, in 525 B.C., and 672 A.D. There is a discrepancy in the annals, as regards the foundation of Cairo; in some accounts Moawiah is said to have built it in 670, which was undoubtedly the medial year of his reign; but the difference is only 2 years, which might have elapsed between his beginning to build the city, and its becoming the seat of the government of Egypt. In calculating from the first subjugation of the Egyptian kingdom by the Asiatics, under Cambyses, to A.D. 1867, we find 2392 years, which is the double of 1197, minus two years. Prospectively, therefore, we may expect some great event, in which the oldest African kingdom is concerned, somewhere between 1866 and 1869 A.D.*

SECTION II.—*Historical proofs in reference to Great Britain.*

The number 1197 appears conspicuously in the history of Great Britain. The accession of James I, in 1603, was the event which brought the whole island under one rule. From the time of the Romans it had not been even nominally in that position. The Roman abandonment of their sovereignty, in the early part of the fifth century, was the only notable corresponding occurrence in its history, as regards the domination of an *external* power. At that time the shadow of *foreign* domination ceased, and the inhabitants of Britain were left to their own internal troubles and petty wars, without the intervention of any external power, until the arrival of the Saxons.

---

* Reverting to the early history of that ancient kingdom, we might also speculate upon 1722 B.C. as the year of some *past* notable event. In the unsettled state of opinion among Egyptian chronologists about the dates of early reigns, it would be adventurous to fix upon the name of the ancient monarch, who is supposed to have been the Pharaoh of that day. The Hebrew chronologists affirm that Joseph was governor of Egypt seven years afterwards; and in the most modern collation of the Egyptian records, Osirtasen I is supposed to have been the monarch of the country at that time.

Historians are not agreed upon the precise date of the formal renunciation of the Emperor Honorius, during whose reign the abandonment was complete; although they concur in stating that the last of his many letters on the subject was written in 409 A.D. But it is evident that the virtual severance of the province of Britain from the empire had occurred previously, during 406, when the soldier Constantine assumed the purple in England, and passed over into Gaul with all the Roman troops he could collect. He afterwards fought his way into Spain (being successful in his battles with the Vandals and Burgundians, and the imperial general), and so completely established himself beyond the Pyrenees, that the weak Honorius admitted his partnership in the empire of the West, and solicited his aid against the Goths. From 406 Britain was drained of its Roman garrisons.

This precise date fixes the interval between the virtual cessation of the Roman authority in Great Britain, and the consolidation of the British realms under James I as sole monarch, at 1197 years; because 1603—406=1197. It is worthy of remark, that the events thus placed in juxtaposition, are rather geographical or territorial, than personal; for James I had been King of Scotland for many years before he succeeded to the English throne: the great political event was, the union of the two kingdoms which constituted the island. The retirement of the

Romans was the cessation of that foreign interference, which had originally introduced Britain to the knowledge of the then civilised world, when Julius Cæsar first visited it, 55 B.C.

Having found that the most striking *eventual* analogy in British records is that of the restoration of a *native* dominion, and that 1197 prevails as remarkably in this instance, as in others already noticed, let us proceed to the obvious division of this great interval, by fixing upon the dates of notable occurrences during the 1197 years, in a tabular form.

	A.D.	INTERVALS.
Retirement of the Romans, the Britons left to themselves	406	49
First year of the reign of Hengist the Saxon .	455	561
First year of the reign of Canute the Dane .	1016	25
First year of the restoration of the Anglo-Saxon power, under Edward the Confessor . .	1041	25
Battle of Hastings. Conquest by the Normans	1066	419
Battle of Bosworth. Usurpation of the throne by the Tudors, coloured by the marriage with a Plantagenet	1485	118
Accession of James I, previously King of Scotland. The whole island under one monarch .	1603	
		1197

The prevalence of many important numbers appears in the above table. 49, or 7^2, marks the interval of independence, when the inhabitants of this island were not under the influence of foreigners, although distracted by their own internal wars.

If we extend the retrospective inquiry to Cæsar's first invasion of Britain, in 55 A.D., we find a previous interval of 461 years from that event, to the virtual abandonment of the sovereignty of the island by the Romans, in 406 A.D. The power of the foreign Saxons commenced in 455 A.D., and was supplanted by that of the Danes in 1016 A.D., exhibiting another interval of 561 years; which not only differs from that ascribed to the Roman period by the exact quantity of 100, but also manifests the same quantity, 161, whether it be added to 300 in one instance, or to 400 in the other.*

The two next short intervals in the table are exactly alike, both being 25, or 5^2 years; and it is curious that the preceding short interval should be 49 or 7^2 years.

If we add the three periods of 561, 25, and 25 years (occupied by the dominion of the Saxons and Danes), we attain a total of 611 years. And if we advance beyond the great period of 1197, which ends with the accession of James I, in 1603 A.D., and consider the death of Queen Anne as the termination of the completely British dynasty, we meet with an interval of 111 years. George I succeeded her in 1714 A.D.; he was previously a German sovereign, as James I had been a Scottish king, before he mounted the British throne. In both cases, the right was derived from personal inheritance; but in that of James, a British sovereign united the two portions of the island, while in that of the accession of the house of Brunswick, the Elector of Hanover's coming over from Germany was the re-introduction of a *geographically* foreign supremacy.

---

* It has been already remarked, that 119 and 161 are the *analogous* numbers, on each side of the theoretical mean of 140, in the second series of cabalistic quantities, beginning with 77, and ending with 203—and that they are equally applicable to intervals between occurrences implying a decided change, although one of a *subordinate* character, in some continuous system (see note in p. 35). The system in question is the history of Great Britain; the events referred to are the cessation of two analogous foreign supremacies, and the substitution of a new power. $161+(3\times10^2)$ is the Roman interval; $161+(4\times10^2)$ is the Saxon interval. Both formulas are anticipated in the theoretical portion of this essay.

Each of these general periods of 611 and 111 years, was remarkable for analogous subordinate changes. The Saxons were supplanted by the Danes, who lost their power upon the accession of Edward the Confessor. The reign of the Stuarts was interrupted by the predominance of the English Cromwells, and afterwards by that of William III: but Anne derived her right from her father, as a Stuart, and was the last of her race; and as William and Mary were joint sovereigns till 1694, there was only an interval of seven years, between the deaths of Mary and her husband, when Great Britain could be considered as the realm of a foreign sovereign.

In comparing these dates, as regards the 611 years between the accession of Hengist and the battle of Hastings,—and the 111 years between the accession of James I and the death of Anne,—we observe the obvious difference of 500 years, which has the same secular character as that of the 100, between the 461 years, from the first invasion of Cæsar to the retirement of the Romans, and the 561 years, from the commencement of Hengist's avowed assumption of the kingdom of Kent, to the accession of Canute the Dane. The prevalence of the remarkable number 111 has been already noticed in the last section, in reference to the successful revolt of the Egyptians against the Persians, and the similar intervention of a *native* dynasty (see p. 60); and it is *theoretically* one of the most obvious in analysis with respect to our earliest numerical ideas of combination, since it is based upon

10 (the primal categorical total of 1, 2, 3, 4, or of all the unproductive numbers)—the productive principle of the multiplying square in connexion with 10—and the unit in the abstract, $10+10^2+1=111$.

The period of the Norman and Plantagenet dominion ended with Richard III, at the battle of Bosworth, in 1485 A.D., 419 years after the battle of Hastings. Whatever might have been the constitutional right of Henry VIII to the throne through his mother, his father, Henry VII, was an usurper, and the Tudors reigned over England (but not over Great Britain) in virtue of his conquest. The battle of Bosworth field was a notable political event, in relation to the substitution of a British for the foreign dynasty, which founded its hereditary claims upon a descent from William the Norman.

The first obvious analysis of 419 (in accordance with the theory) divides it into 19 and 400, where the secular character of the adjunct to the important 19, presents a combination as remarkable as any heretofore observed. If we want the other neighbour of 140, namely 119 (which is the analogue of 161, already noticed as the limit of a change in a continuous system, with regard to the Roman and Saxon periods), we have only to divide the total, 419, into 300 and 119, instead of 400 and 19.

The analysis of the whole 1197, would have been complete, in reference to the dates of leading subordinate events, had the Tudors reigned 119 years; but the interval between the battle of Bosworth and the death of Elizabeth, was not quite 118 years; and as accuracy must not be sacrificed to the desire to establish proofs of coincidence, we are not warranted in availing ourselves of the approximation.

The most important occurrences during the period of 111 years which intervened between 1603, or the accession of James I, and 1714, or the death of Anne, were the abolition and restoration of the monarchical form of government, in 1648 and 1660. Charles I was not beheaded till the end of January 1649; but Hume informs us, that "the House of Commons ordered a new great seal to be engraved, on which that assembly was represented with this legend: 'On the first year of freedom, by God's blessing restored, 1648.'" As the King of Scotland succeeded to the English crown in 1603, the intervals were 45 years from that year to the establishment of the commonwealth, and 57 years from the accession of James to the restoration of the kingly power in the person of his grandson, Charles II.

We have already found 45 and 57 in the table developed by successive additions of 12 to 9 (as a basis), where the precise number 57 follows 45 in the series.* This peculiar harmony prevails in the history of England under the Stuarts. In 1672-3, the famous Cabal had completed their preparations for striking the death-blow at her liberties, under the influence of France; the principle of absolute monarchy was daringly praised in the British Parliament, as against the Dutch, who were driven to extremes by Louis XIV. The contest between the court and the country in England was at its crisis: the king had "his army encamped at Blackheath, under the command of Marshal Schomberg, a foreigner; and many of the officers were of the Catholic religion. His ally, the French king, he might expect, would second him, if force became requisite for restraining his discontented subjects, and supporting the measures which, by common consent, they had agreed to pursue. But the king was startled when he approached so dangerous a precipice as that which laid before him."* The result of the vacillation of Charles II, was the change of policy of Shaftesbury, who made his peace with the country party. " Never turn was more sudden, or less calculated to save appearances." This important change, which saved Great Britain from a civil war, occurred in the 24th year from the death of Charles I, and in the 69th from the accession of James, his father.

---

* See note p. 47.

Twelve years afterwards, in 1685, James II succeeded to the throne. The event was more than a mere change in the person of the sovereign ; it was that of the policy of the court, and of the religious influence of the head of the state, which became so intolerable to the nation, that the revolution of 1688 was the result. In 1685, the interval of 81 years from the accession of James I had been fulfilled, and all the intervening periods of 12 years between its medial, 45, had been marked by some great event. The republic was proclaimed in 1648, forty-five years after the union of the Scottish and English crowns; the restoration of the monarchy occurred in 1660; the conspiracy of the Cabal, to make the monarch absolute, was virtually crushed in the winter of 1672-3, by the hesitation of the king and the consequent defection of Shaftesbury; and the second contest was postponed for exactly 12 years from after the meeting of Parliament in 1673,

---

* Hume.

Feb. 4, when Shaftesbury commenced his intrigues against his own liberticide policy, till the death of Charles II, which occurred Feb. 6, 1785.

If we adopt the same method of searching for the *analogous* numbers, in reference to the *preceding* portions of the interval, namely 9, 21, and 33, which respectively correspond with 81, 69, and 57 (90 being the common sum total of each couplet), we find 1603+9=1612; 1603+21=1624; 1603+33=1636. Each of these dates is historically of importance. In the 1613th year, the 10th from his accession, James I lost his eldest son, Prince Henry, and married his daughter to the Elector Palatine; the descendants of that marriage being the members of the House of Brunswick, who became the sovereigns of the British empire. In the 1625th, the 22nd from his accession, James I died, and was succeeded by his second son, Charles I, who was immediately engaged in that contest with the Commons, which subsequently cost him his throne and life. In 1637, the 34th year from the accession of his father, the Covenant was established in Scotland, and the famous trial of Hampden occurred in England, which were the simultaneous events that ushered in the great rebellion.

The chronological table of all the above notable events, in reference to the theoretical series of 9, 21, 33, 45, 57, 69, and 81, is as follows:*

---

* In accordance with the theory of analogous numbers, the *medial event* of the period is the abolition of the monarchy, numerically represented by 45. The *preceding* occurrence, represented by 33, is the establishment of the Covenant in Scotland, which, with the trial of Hampden in England, were the preludes of the great catastrophe. The interval between these events, is the same as that between the death of Charles I and the return of Charles II;

Dates from the		A.D.	INTERVALS.
	Accession of James I	1603	
9	Death of Prince Henry, and marriage of the Princess to the Elector Palatine	1612-13	9
21	Death of James I, and commencement of the contest between the Crown and the Commons	1625	12
33	Scottish Covenant, and trial of Hampden	1637	12
45	Establishment of the Commonwealth	1648-9	12
57	Restoration of the Monarchy	1660	12
69	Secession of Shaftesbury, and postponement of the struggle between the despotic and constitutional principles	1672-3	12
81	Death of Charles II, and consequent conflict between the two principles	1685	12
		Years	81
		Months	10

the whole period of the crisis being 24 years, equally divided by the date of the culminating incident. The trial of Hampden, and the restoration of the monarchy, were the beginning and end of the crisis.

The next analogous numbers are 21 and 69. The first of these quantities, 21, applies practically, in the above table, to the accession of Charles I, when the differences between the Crown and Parliament assumed a new and more formidable aspect than had been witnessed in England since the time of Richard II, and the struggle for mastery really commenced. The other number, 69, applies to the time when his son, Charles II, relinquished the project of making himself absolute, and the treasonable Cabal were neutralized by the change in the policy of Shaftesbury. We here find the beginning and end of the continued efforts of the first and second Charles to make themselves independent of Parliament.

The third couplet in the numerical series, is 9, 81. In the 10th year of the general period, the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth with the Elector Palatine, prepared the way for the advent of the House of Brunswick, who superseded the direct male descendants of James II. In the 82nd year the death of Charles II led to the ruin of his brother, who was driven from the throne by his daughter's husband. The whole period thus occupied, is only 81 years and 10 months; but the common number of each couplet is 90=9+81=21+69=33+57. See note, page 47.

The accession of James II opened a new chapter in the history of England. On the 7th of February 1689, exactly four years after his proclamation, he was formally deposed; and, although his daughter Anne subsequently succeeded to the crown, on the demise of the foreigner, William III, the legitimate heirs to the throne, her brother and his sons, who were the real representatives of the House of Stuart, were permanently excluded. The reign of James II occupies too short an interval to admit of its being applied in accordance with the same series, to any such theoretical scheme of numerical harmony, as that which agrees so systematically with the transactions of the previous 81 years.

The interval between the declaration of both Houses of Parliament, in 1689, that the throne was vacant, and the death of William III, was 12 years and 1 month; he died on the 8th of March, 1701: but the determination of the Convention that it was a Parliament, which was followed by the King's speech on the 18th of February 1789, reduces the supernumerary month to 18 days. We thus find that the foreign domination lasted during the same general period of 12 years, which appears so remarkably in the analysis of the 81 years intervening between the deaths of Elizabeth and Charles II; and that the break in this instance was the same, with respect to the number of years, as that between the abolition of the monarchy, before the death of Charles I, and its restoration, upon the return of Charles II.*

---

* The reign of Anne lasted 13 years and nearly 5 months, or during the precise period of 4893 days; which number is

The quiet succession of the last Stuart sovereign, Queen Anne, was the analogue of the return of Charles II, so far as the resumption of the throne by a member of that family is concerned; but there was nothing in the occurrence either of a revolutionary or counter-revolutionary character; the form of government was unchanged by the event; and the same remark may be made with respect to the accession of the House of Brunswick, which was as regular a transaction as that of the House of Stuart, while it was not remarkable, as that had been, for any event like the union of the English and Scottish crowns.

The interval of 111 years between the deaths of the two Queens, Elizabeth and Anne, may therefore be treated as of less importance with regard to the history of the country, than that of the 81 years, which is found to be so accurately divisible by a succession of events, affecting the monarchy and the peace of the whole island. The short period of four years, which elapsed between the death of Charles II and the assumption of the kingly power by William III, was

---

reducible to the formula of $(203\frac{1}{2}\times2\times12)+9=4893$, where the number 203 appears in connexion with 12 and 9.

The reign of George I lasted six weeks less than 13 years, or precisely 4697 days, being 196 days shorter than that of Queen Anne. The mean of the two reigns is about 13 years and 47 days. But there is no occurrence connected with the change in the person of the sovereign, bearing upon the political or social history of Great Britain, since 1688; and the last royal demise which was a great event in her destinies, is evidently that of Charles II, when his successor endeavoured to subvert her civil and religious liberties, and lost his throne in the attempt. The death of Anne might have been such an epoch, but the act of succession had guarded against the danger.

undoubtedly one of a continued crisis, during which the civil and religious liberties of the whole kingdom were in peril. But from the revolution of 1688 to the present day, no circumstance of the same moment has occurred, which suggests the notion of an important date in reference to the territorial unity of Great Britain under the same sovereign, or to the constitutional form of her government. The abortive attempts of James II and his male descendants to regain the throne, are not to be classed as leading occurrences in the history of the island, which interfered with her constitutional system, or general policy at home or abroad.

The great proof of the prevalence of 1197 is, however, as conspicuous in British annals, as in the more general instances already noticed; and the reigns of the three first Stuarts exhibit an harmonious arrangement of intervals, which coincides with one of the most notable self-suggested theoretical series of analogous numbers, where 9 is the basis, and 12 is the ratio of the successive increase. We have also repeated instances of the influence of the *secular* number in connexion with 161 and 119, the *analogous* quantities in the other theoretical series, in which 77 is the basis, and 21 is the ratio of increase, as regards the earlier times of our history. In that of France, the prevalence of the *secular* number is still more remarkable.

SECTION III.—*Historical proofs in reference to France.*

The history of France exhibits none of those complete conquests by foreign powers which have occurred in England. The three lines of princes who have successively been her kings, in whole or in part, were Franks. From Clovis to Louis XVI, there were two great usurpations, which only substituted one French family for another. The formal deposition of Childeric III, the last Merovingian, and the acknowledgement of Pepin le Bref as king, in 751 A.D.—the death of Louis V, the last Carlovingian, and the accession of Hughes Capet, in 987 A.D.—were events holding no analogy to the Danish or Norman conquests of England, or even to the accession of James I. The only foreign sovereign, during the long period of past French history, was Napoleon; and he, although a Corsican, was born a subject of the King of France. He was educated in France, and passed through his subordinate grades in her army. His advent to power, in 1799 A.D., as First Consul, was the virtual commencement of his reign, exactly 1000 years after his great predecessor, Charlemagne, had been crowned Emperor of the West.

When we examine the chronology of France, we cannot fail to observe the remarkable prevalence of the secular period, in relation to the events of that great nation.

In the year 499 A.D. Clovis was the most powerful Christian sovereign of the West, and his victory over the Burgundians was his crowning triumph, 300 years before the imperial coronation of Charlemagne.

As regards Hugh, the founder of the Capetian dynasty, the year 987 A.D. witnessed his elevation to the throne of France, and his consecration at Rheims; but it was not until two years had elapsed, that he subdued Charles of Lorraine, the uncle of the last Carlovingian king, and reigned with an undisputed title.

The minor change of the House of Bourbon for the House of Valois, occurred in 1589, exactly 600 years afterwards, when Henry IV succeeded to the throne. In 1789 the great French revolution commenced, 800 years after Hugh Capet had subdued his competitor, the legitimate representative of the Carlovingian dynasty, and 200 years from the accession of the first king of the Bourbon branch, in the person of Henry IV. In all these intervals, the secular number is predominant.

We have thus briefly noticed six events most notable in the history of France: three of them, namely, the triumph of Clovis over the Burgundians—the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor of the West—and the elevation of Napoleon to the virtual sovereignty of France as First Consul—occurred respectively in 499 A.D., 799 A.D., and 1799 A.D., exhibiting the intervals $10^2 \times 3$, and 10^3. The other three great epochs belong to the history of the Capets:—they are, the defeat of the last Carlovingian, which confirmed Hugh Capet in his regal dignity—the accession of Henry IV—and the commencement of the first revolution,—in 989 A.D., 1589 A.D., and 1789 A.D., where the two intervals are $10^2 \times 6$, and $10^2 \times 2$.

It is remarkable, that in all these dates, 9 is the quantity of units as regards the Christian era; and that the coronation of Charles VII at Rheims (after Paris had been in the hands of the English, and the sovereignty of the British king had been acknowledged by a considerable portion of the kingdom), should have taken place in 1429 A.D. The short interval which elapsed between the death of Charles VI and the coronation of Charles VII, was the only period during which a foreigner was *de facto* the sovereign of the original Frank territory, and of the metropolitan portion of the kingdom. For seven years the *de jure* king was nominally excluded from the throne; but on the eighth, his star was in the ascendant; and seven years afterwards he obtained possession of Paris, in 1435, the fourteenth year from the death of his father.

The leading dates in French history, according to the method of determining them—which we have adopted with the object of testing the general theory under consideration—are necessarily few, in consequence of this constant national independence, interrupted only by one short interval of seven years, during fourteen centuries; but we have already seen, that where they are obviously fixed by notable dynastic revolutions, or a decided extension of power such as that of Clovis or Charlemagne, they coincide with secular intervals.

The last revolution of 1848, holds the same relation to the doubtful date of the commencement of the reign of Meroveus, whose name was afterwards applied to the first or Merovingian dynasty. The old French chronologists have generally agreed in asserting, that he commenced his reign in 448 A.D., exactly 1400 years previously to 1848. This interval of 1400 years has been already noticed, as one of marked importance in the great contest between Europe and Asia, and as part of a more general period of 1510 years.

The year 1848 will be memorable in general history, as one of revolution, not only in France, but in Germany, Italy, and Hungary, or throughout the whole empire of Charlemagne, with the exception of

Holland and Belgium. It is a surprising coincidence, that if we add 110 to 1400 years, and deduct the total 1510 from 1848, the remainder should be 338 years—and that in 337 A.D. the Roman emperor, Constantine, consented to be baptised, as is generally believed, by an Arian bishop.

Again, in 496 A.D. Clovis was baptised, 110 years before the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was granted by Phocas, the usurper of the imperial throne; this being the second instance in which the number 110 appears in reference to the same class of events, as regards ecclesiastical history—a fact worthy of notice, since it assigns an older claim of independence to the Gallican than to the Roman Church, in connexion with civil authority.

The Roman empire of the West was extinguished in 476 A.D., upon the deposition of the last emperor, Augustulus. Five years afterwards, in 481 A.D., Clovis commenced his reign in France; and whenever the Frank power was concentrated, it became the virtual representative of the extinct Western Empire, notwithstanding the contemporaneous and ephemeral dynasties of the Goths, and other Northern nations, who succeeded each other in the South and beyond the Alps, and their contests with the Eastern emperors. The Lombards, who had at last overturned the Exarchs of Ravenna, were conquered by Charlemagne, when Pope Adrian called in the Frank sovereign as his protector against them, and, in return for such an aid, withdrew from the Eastern Empire, and virtually concurred in the re-establishment of that of the West, in 774 A.D. The successor of Adrian, Pope Leo III, confirmed the act of his predecessor, by the solemn coronation of Charlemagne, in 799 A.D., as emperor, 25 years after the overthrow of the Lombard power.

Although the spiritual supremacy of the Popes of Rome was conceded formally by the edict of Phocas in 606 A.D., the kings of the French were Christian 110 years before the Popes derived their authority from the Eastern emperor; and until the predominating influence of Clovis's successor was invoked by the Pope, his position was that of a vassal of the court of Constantinople, exposed to continued struggles with other Churches, which depended upon the same imperial favour.*

Independently of this patronage of the Pope by France, there are two leading intervals in her history, which exhibit striking theoretical numbers, already noticed in reference to more general events.

First. That of 1000 or 10^3 years, limits the intervening period between the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor, and the *coup d'état* which raised Napoleon to the virtual sovereignty of France. He afterwards assumed the same title, and, like his predecessor, was crowned with as great, if not greater, dignity, since he made the pontiff come to Paris for the ceremony; and he extended the limits of his suzeraintè beyond those of Charlemagne's dominions. As regards the temporal power of the Popedom, he withdrew that delegated political authority, which had been confirmed, if not practically established, by his predecessor.

---

* The Popedom has been more indebted to Christian France than to any other power; its real predominant influence has depended upon her interference. Charlemagne saved the Pope from the Lombards, and emancipated him from the caprice of the Eastern emperors. Nevertheless, the Christianity of France is older than the Papal supremacy; and there was more truth in the manifesto of Napoleon about the protecting suzerainté of his predecessors, when he deprived the Pope of temporal power, than his contemporaries were inclined to admit. Had it not been for the conversion of Clovis to a general Church, and the policy of Charlemagne, the baptism of Constantine by an *Arian* bishop, shortly before his death, and the edict of Phocas, 269 years afterwards, might have been of little service to the Bishops of Rome, who supplanted the Patriarchs of Alexandria, as the chiefs of the *Catholic* Christians, by virtue of an imperial edict of the passing usurper at Constantinople. It is admitted by the best Italian annalists, that the pretended edicts of the Emperor Constantine were forgeries.

Secondly. That of 1400, or $7 \times 2 \times 10^2$ years, intervened between the traditional accession of Meroveus, in 448 A.D., and the last revolution of France, in 1848 A.D., when for the second time in the history of France, the monarchy was superseded by a republican form of government. It is worthy of remark, that in the absence of subjection to *foreign* powers, two such theoretically important numbers as 1000 and 1400, should thus appear in relation to *internal* changes.

The influential number 57 is also apparent in the history of France, with reference to the two overthrows of the monarchy. The meeting of the States General, in 1789, was the beginning of the first struggle; but the climax of the contest between the monarchical and republican principles was complete, when Louis XVI fled from Paris, in 1791. From that time to 1848, there was the interval of 57 years. Two similar events, both leading to the same results, as regards the substitution of a republican for a monarchical form of government, are the historical limits of this interval, although the occurrences of the second were more rapid in succession than those of the first French revolution. With respect to internal changes, these revolutions were the most important events in the history of the French territory, from the time of Clovis to the present day.

The interval of 57 years, between the abortive attempt of Louis XVI to get out of the hands of the revolutionary party, and the abdication of Louis Philippe, is remarkable in reference to the important number 57, not only as the triple multiple of 19, but as one in the series of *analogous* numbers, already discovered to be so coincident with the dates of leading events in the destinies of the House of Stuart, in British history. The accession of James I is the analogue of the commencement of the inevitable predominance of a new system in that of France; and although the specific occurrence in Great Britain was not the counterpart of that in France, because the British event was the union of England and Scotland under one sovereign, while the French event was the substitution of a republican for a monarchical authority, they were both equally epochs in the histories of the two countries; and in that of France, for several centuries, there was no other so evidently introductory to a new system.

Independently of dates, there is a striking parallelism between the revolutions in both countries. The elder branch of the House of Bourbon, and the legitimate representatives of the House of Stuart, were each obliged to abandon their respective territories—they were both restored to their thrones—and they were both exiles a second time, when they were supplanted by the younger branches of their families. The overthrow of the British monarchy in 1648, was the parallel of that of France in 1791; the restoration of Charles II in England, was the parallel of that of Louis XVIII; the abdication of James II, corresponded with that of Charles X, not only generally, but in many details.

The difference, however, is notable, as regards the *commencement* of each general period. In Britain it was marked by the monarchical union of England and Scotland; in France, by the substitution of a new mode of government, for one which had existed for centuries. The same number 57 intervenes between 1603 and 1660, the dates of the accession of James I, and the *restoration of the monarchy*, upon the return of his grandson,—as that which appears between the triumph of the republican party in France in 1791, when Louis XVI was brought back a prisoner from Varennes, and the *restoration of the anti-monarchical principle* in 1848, when Louis Philippe abdicated. The beginning and end of the term of 57 years in Great Britain, had reference to the consolidation and restoration of the monarchy—in France, to the virtual confirmation and restoration of the opposite principle of government. Although there is no similitude in the two cases, there is an analogy with respect to dates, and to the determination of a similar period. The *contrariety* in its decided manifestation of *opposites*, is as striking, philosophically, as if the similitude were perfect.

Having observed this parallelism of the interval of 57 years, let us endeavour to apply the theoretically discovered series of 9, 21, 33, 45, 57, 69, and 81, to the French period, as has been done in the review of the leading incidents of the three first reigns of the Stuarts in England.

The commencement of the French interval is assumed to be 1791 A.D. By adding 9 years, we arrive at the year 1800: then, successively advancing by 12 years, we have the dates of 1812, 1824, 1836, 1848, 1860, and 1872, in accordance with the ratio of increase by 12 years, up to the given number 81.

We have already found 1848 A.D., in the French system, to be the analogue of 1660 A.D. in the English, as regards dates,—and the abdication of Louis Philippe, to be that of the return of Charles II, as regards events; the theoretical number in both cases being 57, although the events are the precise *opposites* in their political characteristics.

Now, upon referring to the history of France during the last 57 years, we see that within a week of the ninth anniversary of the escape of Louis XVI from Paris (he left it in 1791, June 21), the new master of France, as First Consul, gained the important victory of Marengo, 1800, June 14, which led to the confirmation of his power at home, and the isolation of Great Britain as his only important foreign enemy. During 12 years, France proceeded from victory to victory, and at last entered upon the fatal contest with Russia. In the autumn of 1812, the greatest military system of modern days was paralysed by a combination of misfortunes, and the French Emperor was obliged to retreat from Moscow: the flower of his army was annihilated; and thenceforward, until his final overthrow, he experienced a series of disasters, however retarded the catastrophe of 1814 may have been by some well-fought and successful battles, during that and the previous year. His resumption of power in 1815, was an event of little importance in reference to the system, since it only lasted one hundred days.

Twelve years afterwards, in 1824, Louis XVIII died. The elder branch of the Bourbons had been restored in his person. His return and death were the counterparts of those of Charles II in England. The fortune of Napoleon had been the counterpart of that of Oliver Cromwell; although, unlike his English model, he had not imbrued his hands in the blood of his sovereign. The succession of Charles X, in 1824, was no less the counterpart of that of James II in England. The same bigotry and want of foresight, produced the same results; and, like James II, he died in exile. We have already seen that the expatriation of the English king was not an event having a marked place in the theoretical series of numbers: the death of his brother was the occurrence of the 81st year from the time of the union of the crowns of England and Scotland. That of Louis XVIII was, in like manner, *the* event of the 33rd year from the overthrow of the French monarchical power, in 1791: it ushered in the same system of impolitic government in France, as that of James II did in England; both these expatriated kings were but the passing instruments of Providence, whose deaths were of no moment to their respective countries, after their abdications.

But it is remarkable, that Charles X died in 1836, 12 years after his accession, in 1824; and that this is *the most striking event* of the 45th year from 1791, when the French monarch's authority virtually ended, in the first revolution. In applying the series of numbers now under consideration to the history of England, we have found that 45 (the medial of the series) referred to the time of crisis, when the monarchy was abolished, and Charles I was put to death: in the present instance, we discover the same number applicable to an occurrence, which, according to appearances, is of no importance to the destinies of the French nation. The death of Charles I in England, was the political coincidence of the temporary abolition of the British monarchy.

The abdication of Louis Philippe, and the re-establishment of the French Republic, has been already noticed, as the event of the 57th year from 1791: it occurred in the 12th year after the death of Charles X, and in the 24th after that of Louis XVIII. We have seen that the remaining cabalistic numbers, 69 and 81, must be applied to the future years, 1860 and 1872, in order to complete the cycle denoted by this particular theoretical series. If the analogy be complete, a period of 24 years may be expected to elapse before the occurrence of some event, which will give as permanent a tranquillity to France, as that obtained by the British nation, in consequence of the change in 1688.

Another, and a yet more remarkable verification of the theory, as regards the government of France, is developed by a calculation of the interval between the abdication of her two last monarchs, if the more precise standard of days be substituted for that of years. The great political number, in reference to events, is $19 \times 9 \times 19$, or 3249; and twice 3249, or 6498 days, is an interval which prevails with respect to obvious changes. If the reader will examine the special history of any nation, he cannot fail to observe a cycle of between 17 and 18 years, determined by the occurrence of some notable event in its annals. Supposing the four intercalary days of the leap-years to be taken into the account, 6498 days will give precisely 17 years and 289 days.

The following memorandum was written in March 1848, after the arrival of Louis Philippe in England, but before the meeting of the constituent assembly. The writer affirmed, that on the 15th of May in that year, or within two or three days previously or subsequently to that date, there would be an important crisis in the history of France. Many living witnesses can testify to the fact of having read the memorandum previously to the 15th of May, and even before the decision of the temporary government in favour of a constituent assembly to be elected by universal suffrage, had been published.

The assembly met before the expected day; but the first great *émeute*, on the 15th of May (when the populace invaded their place of meeting, and for a time maintained possession of the locality, while a new provisional government was attempted at the Hotel de Ville*), determined the supremacy of the new Convention, and by the failure of the project to upset the assembly, insured its authority. It subsequently proceeded to the discharge of its functions, and agreed upon the form of the republican and anti-monarchical institution, under which the country was to be governed.

---

* The name of Barbès figures conspicuously in the history of these proceedings. It is surprising, that this name should be the one specially noticed in the memorandum, in reference to the *medial* event of Louis Philippe's reign.

It is also worthy of remark, that at Naples, this same 15th of May was the day of barricades, and that the spirit of popular violence had so increased at Vienna, that the Emperor of Austria abandoned his residence in its neighbourhood for Innspruck, on the 17th of May. The coincidence may have been the result of concert; but it is not the less important on that account, in the estimation of those who believe that the most deliberately concerted plans of human beings, are predestined by the wisdom of a Supreme Providence. The simultaneousness of the popular movement on this particular 15th of May, may have been the consequence of some widely-spread scheme of insurrection against existing authorities; but that it should have occurred on the 6498th day from the downfall of Charles X, is the fact which really deserves our especial notice, when the number 6498 is the subject of our consideration.*

---

* The first notion of the writer of the following memorandum about the importance of the number 19, was connected with the idea of a circle consisting of 18 divisions, with the cypher 19 in its centre, as the terminating number of the series. This *special* mode of representing the notion was incorrect, because it confounded the abstract principle of *numerical* certainty, with *geometrical position*, and consequently with the idea of definite *distance in space*. This will account for the use of the phrases "great circle", and "uneven numbers in the great circle".

Subsequent investigation convinced him, that the numerical system, *in the abstract*, ought to be independent of all *spacial or formal* modes of arrangement, although several facts in relation to *opposite* positions of numbers in such a circle, suggested the *formal* method of dividing its circumference into 18 parts. All the even numbers, from 2 to 18 inclusive, equal 90 in addition; and all the uneven numbers, from 1 to 17 inclusive, equal 81. These numbers, 81 and 90, are *theoretically* the correlative quantities which

Memorandum.

1. From the departure of Charles X from the Trianon, when Louis Philippe assumed the government of France, as Lieutenant-General of the king-

respectively constitute the *total,* and the *common measure, of the analogous numbers,* obtained in the series based upon 9, and extended by an advance in the ratio of 12—a series demonstrated to prevail *practically* as regards the histories of Great Britain and France.

There is also an adjusting harmony in such a circle, if the opposite numbers, 1 and 18, 2 and 17, 3 and 16, etc., be added in pairs, giving a total of 19 as the common value of each couplet; although this adjustment would be equally apparent, if the circle were divided into any quantity of parts, with the even numbers on one of its semicircles, and the *uneven* on the other. The common measure (of *opposite* cyphers), in such a case, would be the one number higher than the quantity of parts into which the circle was divided, however numerous the divisions might be. The *theoretical* importance of 19 does not depend upon any such arrangement, but upon its own special attributes in relation to 10; and the importance of 10 is suggested by the first idea of a category, as regards the sum total of the unprolific numbers, 1+2+3+4=10.

Still, this formal or geometrical arrangement of the circle of 18 divisions, with 19 as the idea of a common number, *placed* the whole system in such an harmoniously artificial position, that the idea of 3249 as the great complementary number of the circle (produced by 19, the central cypher, when multiplied into 171, the total of all the preceding cyphers, from 1 to 18, inscribed on its circumference) suggested itself *hypothetically,* before the influence of its double, 6498, had been observed in reference to the daily intervals between analogous or similar events. The inference was, that if the general theory were correct, 3249 ought to prevail practically, as a notable cabalistic quantity.

It had been previously ascertained that the low quantities, from 33 to 203, did so prevail, and it was a problem, *why* they should be thus dominant. In the attempt to solve that problem, the higher numbers, 1197, 1274, 1477, and 3249, suggested themselves *the-*

dom, to Louis Philippe's departure from the Tuileries, after his own abdication, there was an interval of 6417 days.

His power commenced on the 1st of August 1830: it ended on the 24th of February 1848.

	DAYS.
From 1st August to 31st December 1830 . .	153
Days in the years from end of 1830 to end of 1847 .	6209
From 1st January to 24th February 1848 . .	55
	6417

The great circle of 171 × 19 = 3249 = 57^2

Twice the great circle = 6498

Deduct days of Louis Philippe's reign 6417

Deficiency . 81 days

The total of the *uneven* numbers in the great circle is 81, or 9^2.

2. The exact interval from the appointment of his *ad interim* or provisional government, under the Duke de Montebello, on the 3rd of April 1839, to his abdication, was 3249 days, the number of the great circle.*

3. The *exact middle* of his reign, was 41 days (or

---

oretically, before they were observed to have a *practical* influence in the determination of intervals. Subsequent meditation upon the subject has enabled the author to dispense with the *spacial* idea of a circular arrangement, as may be seen in the theoretical chapter of the present essay; but, for reasons which must be obvious, he has not made any change in the wording of the memorandum written before these discoveries were made.

	DAYS.
* In 1839	272
From end of 1839 to end of 1847, including 2 leap years	2922
In 1848	55
	3249

40½ days) afterwards, namely, the 12th of May 1839, when the provisional administration was at an end, Marshal Soult being appointed prime minister. On that day *Barbés* failed in an attempt at insurrection, which was the last *émeute* in Paris. It therefore appears, that during the latter moiety of his reign he was free from overt insurrection in his capital, during 3208 days.*

4. From his accession to power, to that *émeute*, was 3209 days. An insurrection gave him the throne; he was exposed to several attempts at insurrection during the first half of his reign; he was free from them during the latter half; but he was compelled to abdicate, in consequence of an insurrection, at the end of that period.

5. The double of the interval of 40½ days, which marked the existence of his *ad interim* government in 1839 (from which date we commence the coincidence between the number of the great circle, and the quantity of days (3249), from the 2nd of April 1839, to the 24th of February 1848), must be expected to complete the second great circle, when the *present provisional state* of France will end. We must calculate 81 days from the 24th of February.† This will suggest the 15TH OF MAY in the present year, as the 6498th day from that in which the dynasty of the elder branch of the Bourbons lost the throne.

6. A similar interval of 6498 days will have elapsed on the 1st of March 1866.

---

* 3208
3209
6417 days.

† 6417
81
6498 days.

7. If we calculate *retrospectively* from the 31st of July 1830, the number 6498 will give the 15th of October 1812, as the beginning of a *past* interval. Four days after that date Napoleon commenced his disastrous retreat from Moscow—the beginning of his misfortunes,—in which the severity of the climate destroyed the greatest army France had ever sent forth upon one expedition.

8. Again, calculating retrospectively from the 15th October 1812, we find that 6498 days bring us to the 1st of January 1795. On the 4th of that month the French troops, *befriended by the cold*, recommenced their movement on the ice of the Dutch waters, which ended in the conquest of Holland, and the retreat of the English from that country. Napoleon came to Paris early in that year; and, on the 4th of October 1795, he was selected to command the army in Paris, which overwhelmed the sections.*

---

* The above memorandum left an impression on the writer's mind, that the day of meeting of the constituent assembly would be the 15th of May, and that the event would be accompanied by some popular outbreak, like that which really occurred on that day; but although it seemed probable that the result might be the violent dissolution of the assembly, considering the unsettled state of the French capital at that time, every argument deduced from a review of analogies, was against the restoration of the regal authority. The 15th of May was looked forward to, as the beginning of new *phases* in the history of France.

In the above enumeration, the year 1866 A.D. is suggested as of great moment in the future destinies of France; and as events have already proved, that the 15th of May was the precise day of the first attack upon her national constituent assembly, which confirmed its authority, we may conjecture (if there be any truth in our general theory), that 6498 days will elapse before the occurrence of another such analogous event. Nothing, however, in the antecedents of her history will warrant the prophecy, that in reference to the intermediate time, there may not be as many changes, as those which occurred between the subjugation of the sections of Paris by Napoleon, and his retreat from Moscow.

But as regards the other series of 81 years, which seems to have commenced in 1791, and in which that immense catastrophe (the retreat from Moscow) also occupies a place as the limit of an interval, we have found two other prospective years of crisis, namely 1860, and 1872—the *medial* of which is 1866, the precise year noticed in the above memorandum, when, as respects the beginning of March, something analogous to the abortive attack on the national assembly on May 15th, may be expected to occur.

It must also be borne in mind, that the 15th of May 1848, was not merely the date of a crisis at Paris, but in other capitals of foreign European States, which were formerly under the authority of the Emperor Charlemagne, who was the protector and the renovator of the spiritual as well as the temporal authority of the Popedom; and without venturing to predict about details, we may speculate upon the probability, that 1866 will be a year of great events, not only in France, but throughout Western Europe.

In an early part of the present essay, it has been remarked, that there are three modes of proving the truth of the theory, in reference to the prevalence of certain given numbers of years or days, which constitute the intervals between analogous or similar events; either by an examination of history—or by an inspection of personal journals—or by an investigation of prophecies which have been fulfilled.

So much space has been devoted, in the preceding pages, to the first of these methods of verification, that, even if there were no other reasons for avoiding any further endeavour to prove the main allegation, the fear of wearying the reader would be sufficient. His own observation must be appealed to: his journal, if he has patience to keep one in the manner recommended, will adduce abundant testimony in support of the doctrine, that this prevalence of specific numbers, as regards notable intervals between events, or the forebodings of such events and their occurrence, is as certain in matters of the most seemingly insignificant character, as in those which are generally acknowledged to be of paramount importance.

CHAPTER IV.

RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS ON THE RELATION OF NUMBERS TO EVENTS.

The unprejudiced philosopher, whose unceasing effort is to divest his mind of all habitual modes of prejudging a question, ought to be as fearful of being considered obstinately incredulous, as of being ridiculed for his credulity. We are surrounded by illusory and conventional substitutes for truth, from the first dawning of our circumscribed intelligence. The gossip of the nursery never ceases to have some latent hold upon the imagination, and to give a false tint to the notions of a more advanced period of our mental activity. Early traditions, inculcated in the first stages of education, create new prejudices, or foster those which are connected with our vague thoughts of childhood.

But where the energy of the human mind is sufficient to enable it to think for itself, independently of all previous conclusions, and to disbelieve all that is not in accordance with its own power of reason, there is the opposite danger of our assuming, that it is capable of universal comprehension, and that its own limited reason is *pure* reason—that its will is free-will—and that the human creature, in this respect, is the counterpart of the Supreme Intelligent Being. The proud free-thinker begins by making God in his own image; and ends by denying the supremacy of a Divine Providence,—forgetting that all the faculties of the human mind are those of a *material* organisation, which differs only in degree from others among the vertebrated animals of this planet.

The inevitable result of this conceit is practical atheism. The atheistical materialist never supposes his own intellect to be subordinate to an Eternal Mind, which has disposed the phenomenal universe in reference to one great end. It is the confusing error of his argument, that his own mind is the "ne plus ultra" of *potential* mental capacity; and he overlooks the main distinction between the limited faculties of intellect depending upon *a material brain*, and those illimitable powers of the Supreme Intelligence, which have ordained the physiology of such a material organ of thought in his fellow-animals, and in his own body. His idea of God is vaguely limited by his idea of his own finite reason. Beyond this, he admits the existence of abstract truths, as a sort of *composite destiny;* but he denies that an Eternal Intelligent Mind deals with every incident in the phenomenal world.

Not only does he make God in his own image, but he bounds the Divine apprehension by the measure of his own; and where his prescience or knowledge is imperfect, he disposes of the difficulty by assuming that there is no omnipotent and infallible Eternal Mind, which, reasoning for the best, and with a perfect knowledge as regards the everlasting past and everlasting future, disposes of all events according to reason. The silly King of Spain, who told his courtiers, that if it had been his task to make the world, they would have seen a very different system, was not more foolish than the atheist, who is convinced that Chance is the supreme disposer of accidents, because his philosophy is at fault in his review of the wisdom of the Divine harmony.

Far different is the philosophy of the theist, who, in ancient and modern days, has insisted upon the wisdom of Divine Providence, and who, without superstition, has advocated the doctrine of submission to the Divine Disposer of events. He sees nothing *fortuitous* in any part of the scheme; his notions of the laws of Nature are those of a predetermined system, where there is a general progressive development of "good", and in which the moral laws, appreciable by the gradually-civilised human inhabitants of this small astronomical portion of the material world, belong to the system of Nature. He looks forward to the triumph of truth in morals as well as in physics, even in reference to mundane events—but he believes that the system of Nature contains within itself the elements of this gradual improvement, and that under the eternal government of the Supreme Calculating Intelligence, every event has been, and is, arranged in relation to every other event, from the lowest physical incident, to the highest moral impulse of the human organisation.

It is in accordance with our most reasonable mode of argument, that the most harmonious of all abstract sciences, namely that of arithmetic, should have been applied by the Divine and Eternal Intelligent Being to political as well as to physical events—and that the organic as well as the inorganic bodies upon the earth's surface, should hold relations to obvious numerical laws. That certain fixed quantities of days and years prevail with respect to the growth and fructification of plants, and the habits of animals, as regards their respective impulses, instincts, times of gestation, education of their offspring, etc., is undeniable. One perfectly considerate Mind creates, preserves, and dissolves all individualised combinations of matter throughout space; and the great scheme would be incomplete, if the *social* affairs of our species were not as precisely regulated in relation to eventual intervals.

It may be objected to the general argument of this essay, that the doctrine inculcated is that of fatalism. To such an objection, so far as prejudice is concerned, there is no answer but an appeal to facts and to reason. Unless every event were pre-ordained in relation to every other event, past, present, and future, there could be no universal harmony of phenomena: and however humiliating it may be to our vanity, to become convinced that some of the best concerted schemes of the human brain are predetermined by a Divine Providence, *as personal misfortunes*, with a view to some end more general than the realisation of any of our individual projects,—the Christian philosopher ought not to be startled by the assertion of such a doctrine, which will alone account for the *suffering* and undeserved punishment of the Saviour.

The doctrine of predestination is most wholesome. It brings down the mighty of the earth to the level of their lowest and poorest fellow-creatures, over whom, for a time, they are allowed to domineer. It teaches them, that they are but instruments in the plans of that Supreme Intelligent Being, who has arranged all the phenomena of the physical world, in accordance with his own unerring ideas of truth, without caprice or predilections for human grandeur. He has distributed to the human species mental faculties of appreciating those truths in logic, arithmetic, and geometry, upon which his own physical and political adjustments of cosmical events are based, without any surrender of his omnipotent authority over events.

The existence of the highest human creature is only one of the passing incidents in the Supreme scheme; the longest human life seldom exceeds a century; and the most powerful monarch in the civilised world, although greater in the political hierarchy of this little planet, may be *personally* (as regards his own sentiment of *selfish* majesty) the counterpart of any blood-stained despot in a tribe of savages. The comparatively magnificent aspirations of a Cæsar, a Charlemagne, or a Napoleon, are but passing incidents in the same general chapter of this world's history, in which we read of a tiger-like King of Ashantee, whose notions of adequate dignity were connected with the annual *watering* of his predecessor's grave by the blood of many thousand human victims. In a higher but earlier stage of civilisation, Augustus sacrificed his human hecatombs, at Perugia, to the memory of his uncle Julius; and, at a later period, Philip II of Spain immolated hundreds, amongst whom were some of the noblest of his subjects, on living funeral-piles, in honour of his idea of true religion. These were *events*, like the destruction of flies in a spider's web, preordained by the Supreme Providence, through the instrumentality of animal prejudice and passion; but preordained in reference to the same general system which produced a Chosroes and a Mahomet, each at his appointed moment.

The truly religious philosopher, in bowing down before such facts, does not presume to question the *truth* of the Supreme scheme. Where isolated events suggest the notion of injustice, he discovers that unless they occurred in the " system of Nature", the ultimate object of a *gradual* improvement could not have been attained. The whole plan of human destinies is physical: " the rain of heaven falls equally upon the just and the unjust".

The humble-minded reasoner, who believes in the future existence of his own soul, after the dissolution of the material body which he animates, believes in " a mode of being" which is independent of nature. He finds a compensation in that idea of prospective freedom, for his undeniable subjection to a natural system, in which he is himself an incident, whether his destiny may have brought him into this world as an hereditary prince, or as the offspring of a parish pauper: and his notions of moral duty to God and to his neighbour, are not weakened by this conviction. As an honest man, he must labour during his mortal pilgrimage to contribute to the welfare of his fellow-creatures, without allowing *selfish motives* to misdirect his limited will. His reason may be blinded by illusions, and he may be pre-ordained to failure and misfortune; but his moral responsibility will be determined *at last* by that great Judge of right and wrong, who has fixed the limits of his finite intelligence, during his incarnation in a material body.

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
3 1197 00673 5804

DATE DUE

FEB 8 1982
FEB 3 REC'D
JUL 4 1984
JUN 2 5 [illegible]
APR 1 1 1987
APR 2 1987
SEP 1 2 1988
[illegible] 2 8 [illegible]
JUL 3 0 1994
JUN 2 9 1994

DEMCO 38-297